

Università degli Studi di Salerno  
DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE ECONOMICHE E STATISTICHE

Rosa Ferrentino\*

POINTWISE WELL-POSEDNESS IN VECTOR  
OPTIMIZATION AND VARIATIONAL INEQUALITIES

WORKING PAPER 3.165  
Luglio 2005

\* Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Statistiche – Università degli Studi di Salerno – via Ponte Don Melillo – 84084 Fisciano (Salerno), rferrentino@unisa.it



Abstract .....	3
Introduction.....	5
1. Tykhonov well-posedness of scalar optimization problems and variational inequalities. ....	6
2. Well-posedness of vector optimization problems and of vector variational inequalities .....	13
3. Main results.....	19
References.....	26



## **Abstract**

In this note we consider some notions of well-posedness for scalar and vector variational inequalities and we recall their connections with optimization problems. Subsequently, we investigate similar connections between well-posedness of a vector optimization problem and a related variational inequality problem and we present an result obtained with scalar characterizations of vector optimality concepts.



## Introduction

The notion of well-posedness is significant for several mathematical problems and in particular it plays a crucial role in the stability theory for optimization problems. It is also important in establishing convergence of algorithms for solving scalar optimization problems and, in fact, it has been studied in different areas of scalar optimization, such as mathematical programming, calculus of variations and optimal control.

Two different concepts of well-posedness are known. The first, due to J. Hadamard, requires existence and uniqueness of the optimal solution and studies its dependence from the data of the considered optimization problem. The second approach, introduced by A. N. Tykhonov, in 1966, requires, instead, besides existence and uniqueness of the optimal solution, the convergence of every minimizing sequence to the unique minimum point. The two notions (well-posedness in the sense of Hadamard and of Tykhonov) are equivalent at least for continuous objective functions [2]. The links between Hadamard and Tykhonov well-posedness have been studied by Lucchetti and Patrone [13],[15] and by Revalski [17],[18]. There, besides uniqueness, additional structures are involved: in [13], for example, basic ingredient is convexity. We will deal with well-posedness of Tykhonov type.

The notion of well-posedness for a vector optimization problem is, instead, less developed; there is not a commonly accepted definition of well-posed problem, in vector optimization. Some attempts in this direction have been already done (see [3],[12]) and have been made some comparisons with their scalar counterparts [16].

In the present paper, we recall some basic aspects of the mathematical theory of well-posedness in scalar optimization and, subsequently, in vector optimization. Moreover, in this note, we establish basic well-posedness results for scalar and vector variational inequalities. The paper is organized as follows.

In section 2 we review, first, some results on well-posedness for a scalar optimization problem, and, then, for a scalar variational inequality of differential type. In section 3 we present and investigate the notion of well-posedness in vector optimization ( in particular a type of pointwise well-posedness and strong pointwise

well-posedness for vector optimization problems) and, subsequently, the notion of well-posedness for a vector variational inequality. Finally, section 4, is devoted to the main results of our paper obtained by means of scalar characterizations of vector optimality concepts.

### 1. Tykhonov well-posedness of scalar optimization problems and variational inequalities.

To study the well-posedness of an optimization problem means to investigate the behaviour of the variable when the corresponding objective function value is close to the optimal value. In this section we give a characterization of Tykhonov well-posedness for the problem of minimizing a function  $f$  on a closed, convex set  $K$  and we summarize some known results. Let  $f : R^n \rightarrow R$  be a real-valued function and let  $K$  be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of  $R^n$ . We consider the scalar optimization problem:

$$\min_{x \in K} f(x)$$

which we denote by  $P(f, K)$  and which consists in finding  $x^* \in K$  such that

$$f(x^*) = \inf \{ f(x), x \in K \} = \inf_K f(x)$$

In the theory of optimization are interesting the following properties of the minimization problem  $P(f, K)$ :

- a) existence of the solution, (i.e.  $P(f, K)$  has a solution)
- b) uniqueness of the solution, (i.e. the solution set for  $P(f, K)$  is a singleton)
- c)  $x^*$  is a good approximation of the solution of  $P(f, K)$ , if  $f(x^*)$  is close to  $\inf_K f(x)$

If the problem  $P(f, K)$  satisfies together the properties a) and c) is said well-posed. More precisely:

*The problem  $P(f, K)$  is said Tykhonov well-posed if there exist exactly one  $x^* \in K$  such that  $f(x^*) \leq f(x)$  for all  $x \in K$ , and if*

$x_n \rightarrow x^*$  for any sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset K$  such that  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x^*)$  ( i.e.  $f(x_n) \rightarrow \inf_K f(x)$ ).

Recalling that a sequence  $\{x_n\} \subseteq K$  is a minimizing sequence for problem  $P(f, K)$  when  $f(x_n) \rightarrow \inf_K f(x)$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , the previous definition can be rephrased, in equivalent way, so:

**Definition 2.1:** The problem  $P(f, K)$  is said Tykhonov well-posed if  $f$  has, on  $K$ , a unique global minimum point,  $x^*$ , and every minimizing sequence for  $P(f, K)$  converges to  $x^*$ .

Definition 2.1 is motivated by since usually every numerical method for solving

$P(f, K)$  provides iteratively some minimizing sequences  $\{x_n\}$  for  $P(f, K)$  and therefore one wants to be sure that the approximate solutions  $x_n$  are not far from the (unique) minimum  $x^*$ . The idea of the behaviour of the minimizing sequences was used by different authors to extend this concept in two directions: first, introducing strengthened notions and, second, considering the case in which the optimal solutions are not unique.

**Remarks 2.1:**

a) It is easy to see that if  $K$  is compact and  $f$  is lower semicontinuous, then  $P(f, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed if it has a unique solution.

b) For a continuous function  $f$  Tykhonov well-posedness of  $P(f, K)$  simply means that every minimizing sequence is convergent.

c) When  $K$  is compact, the uniqueness of the solution of a minimization problem is enough to guarantee its well-posedness but there are however simple examples when uniqueness of the solution of  $P(f, K)$  is not enough to guarantee its Tykhonov well-posedness even for continuous function. Take e.g.  $K = \mathbb{R}$  and

$f(x) = x^2 / x^4 + 1$ . Obviously,  $P(f, K)$  has a unique solution at zero while  $\{x_n = n\}$  provides a minimizing sequence which does not converge to this unique solution. Hence  $P(f, K)$  is not Tykhonov well-posed.

Tykhonov well-posedness of  $P(f, K)$  is often stated, equivalently, as *strong uniqueness* of  $\operatorname{argmin}(f, K)$  where with  $\operatorname{argmin}(f, K)$  let we denote the set, possibly empty, of solutions of the minimization problem  $P(f, K)$ .

Problems which are non well-posed will be called *ill-posed*. Sometimes they are referred to as *improperly posed*.

The well-posedness of the minimization problem  $P(f, K)$  in the sense of Tykhonov concerns the behaviour of the function  $f$  in the set  $K$  but it does not take into account the behaviour of  $f$  outside  $K$  [26]. Of course, often, one can come across with minimizing sequences that do not lie necessarily in  $K$  and one wants to control the behaviour of these minimizing sequences, as well. Levitin and Polyak in [18] considered such kind of sequences.

**Definition 2.2 :** The sequence  $\{x_n\}$  is said a *Levitin-Polyak minimizing sequence* for minimization problem  $P(f, K)$  if  $f(x_n) \rightarrow \inf_K f$  and, moreover,  $d(x_n, K) \rightarrow 0$  where  $d(x_n, K) = \inf_{y \in K} \|x_n - y\|$ .

**Definition 2.3:** The problem  $P(f, K)$  is called *Levitin-Polyak well-posed* if it has unique solution  $x^* \in K$  and, moreover, every *Levitin-Polyak minimizing sequence* for  $P(f, K)$  converges to  $x^*$ .

This definition is stronger than the Tykhonov one since requires the convergence to the unique solution of each sequence belonging to a larger set of minimizing sequence than in the Tykhonov case.

In the above definitions is required the existences and the uniqueness of solution towards which every minimizing sequence converges. They, however, admit generalizations which do not require uniqueness of the solution. In other words, the uniqueness requirement can be relaxed and well-posed minimum problems with several solutions can be considered.

Unlike the requirements of existence and stability a), c), the uniqueness is therefore a condition more debatable. In fact, many problems in linear and quadratic programming or many optimization problems are usually considered as well-posed problems, although uniqueness is usually not satisfied [2]. In order to weaken the requirement of uniqueness of the solution, other more general notions of well-posedness have been introduced, depending on the hypotheses made on  $f$  ( and  $K$  ). We recall the concept of well-setness introduced in [2].

**Definition 2.4:** *Problem  $P(f, K)$  is said to be well-set when, for every minimizing sequence  $\{x_n\} \subseteq K$ , we have  $d(x_n, \arg \min(f, K)) \rightarrow 0$  where  $d(x, K)$  is the distance of the point  $x$  from the set  $K$ .*

The following definition gives a generalized version of the Tykhonov well-posedness where the uniqueness of the solution is dropped.

**Definition 2.5:** *Problem  $P(f, K)$  is said Tykhonov well-posed in the generalized sense when every minimizing sequence for  $P(f, K)$  has some subsequence that converges to solution of  $P(f, K)$  i.e. to an element of  $\arg \min(f, K)$ .*

From the definition follows that if  $P(f, K)$  is well-posed in the generalized Tykhonov sense, then  $\arg \min(f, K)$  is nonempty and compact. Moreover, when  $P(f, K)$  is well-posed in the

generalized sense and  $\operatorname{argmin}(f, K)$  is a singleton (i.e. its solution is unique), then  $P(f, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed.

The corresponding generalization of Levitin-Polyak well-posedness follows:

**Definition 2.6:** *The minimization problem  $P(f, K)$  is called generalized Levitin-Polyak well-posed if every Levitin-Polyak minimizing sequence  $\{x_n\}$  for  $P(f, K)$  has a subsequence converging to a solution of  $P(f, K)$ .*

Of course, if at any of the notions of generalized well-posedness is added the uniqueness of the solution, one obtains the corresponding non generalized notion.

Different characterizations of Tykhonov well-posedness for minimization problems determined by convex functions in Banach spaces can be found in the paper of Lucchetti and Patrone [23].

We, now, recall the next results :

**Proposition 2.1** [6]: *Let  $f : K \subseteq R^n \rightarrow R$  be a convex function and let  $K$  be a convex set. If  $f$  has a unique global minimizer on  $K$ , then  $P(f, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed.*

**Proposition 2.2** [10]: *If  $K$  is closed,  $f$  is lower semicontinuous, bounded from below and uniformly quasiconvex on  $K$ , then  $P(f, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed.*

A function  $f : K \subseteq R^n \rightarrow R$  is uniformly quasiconvex [10] if there exists an increasing function  $g : [0, +\infty[ \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$  such that  $g(0) = 0$ ,  $g(t) > 0$  whenever  $t > 0$  and

$$f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \leq \max\{f(x), f(y)\} - g(\|x-y\|) \quad \forall x, y \in K.$$

The following theorem gives an alternative characterization of Tykhonov well-posedness: it uses the set of  $\varepsilon$ -optimal solutions.

**Theorem 2.1** [10]: *If  $P(f, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed, then:*

$$(1) \quad \text{diam}\{\varepsilon - \arg \min(f, K)\} \rightarrow 0$$

for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$

where  $\varepsilon - \arg \min(f, K) := \{x \in K : f(x) \leq \varepsilon + \inf_K f(x)\}$  is the set of  $\varepsilon$ -minimizers of  $f$  over  $K$  and  $\text{diam}$  denotes the diameter of given set.

Conversely, if  $f$  is lower semicontinuous and bounded from below on  $K$ , then condition (1) implies Tykhonov well-posedness of  $P(f, K)$ .

When  $K$  is closed and  $f$  is lower semicontinuous, we can use the sets:

$$L_{K,f}(\varepsilon) = \{x \in R : f(x) \leq \inf(f, K) + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \\ d(x, K) \leq \varepsilon \} \quad \varepsilon > 0$$

to introduce the equivalent notion of well-posedness of  $P(f, K)$ .

**Definition 2.7:** *Let  $K$  be closed and let  $f : K \rightarrow R$  be lower semicontinuous. The minimization problem  $P(f, K)$  is said to well-posed if:*

$$\inf\{\text{diam } L_{K,f}(\varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon > 0\} = 0$$

It is well known that there is a very close connection between optimization problems and variational inequalities. In other words, the well-posedness of a scalar minimization problem is linked to that of a scalar variational inequality and, in particular, to a variational inequality of differential type (i.e. in which the operator is the gradient of a given function). The links between variational inequalities of differential type and corresponding optimization problems have been studied in [17]. Furthermore, by means of Ekeland's variational principle [11], that, as it is well known, is an important tool to prove some results in well-posedness for optimization, a notion of well-posed scalar variational inequality

has been introduced and its links with the concept of well-posed optimization problem have been investigated [23].

We shall deal with variational inequalities of Stampacchia type.

We recall that a point  $x^* \in K$  is a solution of a variational inequality of Stampacchia type when:

$$SVI(F, K) \quad \langle F(x^*), y - x^* \rangle \geq 0 \\ \forall y \in K$$

where  $F : K \subseteq R^n \rightarrow R^n$  while  $K$  is closed and convex .

This problem, introduced by G. Stampacchia, has been recently studied by many authors (see for example [1]), since it describes many economic or engineering problems and it is an efficient tool for investigating vector optimization problems. In many applications, the problems  $SVI(F, K)$  do not always have a unique solution. It is well known that it has a unique solution if the operator  $F$  is strongly monotone and hemicontinuous.

If  $f : R^n \rightarrow R$  is differentiable on an open set containing the convex set  $K$ , we can consider the variational inequality of differential type,  $SVI(f', K)$  where  $f'$  denotes the gradient of  $f$  ( $f$  is a primitive of  $F$ , i.e.  $F = f'$ ). It is known that, under these hypotheses,  $SVI(f', K)$  is a necessary optimality condition for problem  $P(f, K)$ . The following definition gives the notion of well-posed variational inequality of differential type [10].

**Definition 2.8:** The variational inequality  $SVI(f', K)$  is well-posed when:

$$i) T(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

$$ii) \text{diam } T(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{if } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

where  $T(\varepsilon) : \{x \in K : \langle f'(x), x - y \rangle \leq \varepsilon \|y - x\| \quad \forall y \in K\}$  is the approximate solutions set of  $P(f, K)$ .

We can see that  $T(\varepsilon)$  is closed for every  $\varepsilon$ . It is obvious that the set of solutions of  $SVI$  is exactly  $\bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} T(\varepsilon)$ . Then, if the variational

inequality is well-posed,  $\text{diam}T(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  and so the intersection of  $T(\varepsilon)$  is nonempty and shrinks to a single point. Therefore:

**Proposition 2.3** [10] [23]: *If  $f$  is hemicontinuous and lower semicontinuous and if the variational inequality  $SVI(f', K)$  is well-posed, then  $SVI(f', K)$  has a unique solution.*

The converse of proposition 2.3 holds under monotonicity assumptions on  $f$ .

**Proposition 2.4** [10] [19]: *If  $f$  is hemicontinuous and monotone on  $K$  and if the variational inequality has exactly one solution, then it is well-posed.*

The following theorem states that the boundedness of  $T(\varepsilon)$  gives an existence result for variational inequalities [10].

**Theorem 2.2:** *If  $f$  hemicontinuous on  $K$  and  $T(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\varepsilon$  and bounded for at least some  $\varepsilon$ , then the variational inequality  $SVI(f', K)$  has solutions.*

The next theorem gives, instead, the link between Tykhonov well-posedness of  $P(f, K)$  and well-posedness of  $SVI(f', K)$ .

**Theorem 2.3** [10],[23]: *Let  $f$  be bounded from below and differentiable on an open set containing  $K$ . If  $SVI(f', K)$  is well-posed, then problem  $P(f, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed. The converse is true if  $f$  is convex.*

## **2. Well-posedness of vector optimization problems and of vector variational inequalities**

In scalar optimization the different notions of well-posedness are based either on the behaviour of “appropriate” minimizing sequences or on the dependence of optimal solution with respect to the data of optimization problems.

In vector optimization, instead, there is not a commonly accepted definition of well-posedness but there are different notions of well-posedness of vector optimization problems. For a detailed survey on these problems it is possible to refer to [2],[3], [9], [20], [21]. In this section, we propose some of these definitions of well-posedness for a vector optimization problem.

We consider the vector optimization problem:

$$VP(f, K) \quad \min_C f(x)$$

$$x \in K$$

where  $K$  is a nonempty, closed, convex subset of  $R^n$ ,  $f: K \subseteq R^n \rightarrow R^l$  is a continuous function and  $C \subseteq R^l$  is a closed, convex, pointed cone and with nonempty interior. Denote by  $\text{int } C$  the interior of  $C$ .

The cone  $C$  gives an order relation on  $R^l$ , in the following way

$$y_1 \leq_C y_2 \Leftrightarrow y_2 - y_1 \in C$$

$$y_1 <_C y_2 \Leftrightarrow y_2 - y_1 \in \text{int } C$$

We recall that a point  $x^* \in K$  is said to be an *efficient solution* or *minimal solution* of problem  $VP(f, K)$  when:

$$f(x) - f(x^*) \notin -C \setminus \{0\}$$

$$\forall x \in K$$

If, in the above definitions, instead of the cone  $C$  we use the cone  $\tilde{C} = \{0\} \cup \text{int } C$ ,  $x^*$  is said *weak minimal solution*. Then, a point  $x^* \in K$  is said to be a *weakly efficient solution* or *weak minimal solution* of problem  $VP(f, K)$  when:

$$f(x) - f(x^*) \notin -\text{int } C$$

We denote by  $Eff(K, f)$  the set of all efficient solutions (minimal solutions) of problem  $VP(f, K)$  while by  $WEff(K, f)$  the set of weakly efficient solutions (weak minimal solutions) of  $VP(f, K)$ . Moreover, every minimal is also a weak minimal solution but the converse is not generally true.

The image of the set  $Eff(f, K)$ , under the function  $f$ , is denoted by  $Min(f, K)$  and its elements are called *minimal values* of  $VP(f, K)$  Therefore :

$$Min(f, K) = f[Eff(K, f)].$$

Unlike the scalar case, in vector optimization one can hardly expect that the set  $Min(f, K)$  be a singleton.

Analogously:  $WMin(f, K) = f[WEff(K, f)]$

In this section we recall a notion of well-posedness that considers a single point (a fixed efficient point) and not the whole solution set: a particular type of pointwise well-posedness and strong pointwise well-posedness for vector optimization problems. This definition can be introduced considering, as in the scalar case, the diameter of the level sets of the function  $f$ .

Generalizing Tykhonov's definition of well-posedness, for a scalar optimization problem, in [9] are introduced the notions of well-posedness and of strong well-posedness of vector optimization problem  $VP(f, K)$  at a point  $x^* \in Eff(K, f)$  and are provided, also, some conditions to guarantee well-posedness according to these definitions.

**Definition 3.1:** *The vector optimization problem  $VP(f, K)$  is said to be pointwise well-posed at the efficient solution  $x^* \in K$  or Tykhonov well-posed at a point  $x^* \in Eff(K, f)$ , if:*

$$\inf_{k \in C} diam L(x^*, k, \alpha) = 0$$

$$\forall k \in C \quad \forall \alpha > 0$$

where  $diam L$  denotes the diameter of the set:

$$L(x^*, k, \alpha) = \{x \in K : f(x) \leq_c f(x^*) + \alpha k\} = \{x \in K : f(x) \in f(x^*) + \alpha k - C\}$$

**Definition 3.2:** The vector optimization problem  $VP(f, K)$  is said to be strongly pointwise well-posed at the efficient solution  $x^*$ , or Tykhonov strongly well-posed at a point  $x^* \in \text{Eff}(K, f)$ , if :

$$\inf_{\alpha} \text{diam } L_s(x^*, k, \alpha) = 0$$

$\forall k \in C$

where  $\text{diam } L_s$  denotes the diameter of the set :

$$L_s(x^*, k, \alpha) = \{x \in K : f(x) \leq_c f(x^*) + \alpha k \text{ and } d(x, K) \leq \alpha\}$$

For the sake of completeness, we recall that it is also possible to introduce another type of well-posedness of the vector optimization problem  $VP(f, K)$  at a point  $x^* \in \text{Eff}(K, f)$  [16].

**Definition 3.3:** The vector optimization problem  $VP(f, K)$  is said to be  $H$ -well-posed at a point  $x^* \in \text{Eff}(K, f)$  if  $x_n \rightarrow x^*$  for any sequence  $\{x_n\} \subseteq K$ , such that  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x^*)$ .

**Definition 3.4:** The vector optimization problem  $VP(f, K)$  is said to be strongly  $H$ -well-posed at a point  $x^* \in \text{Eff}(K, f)$  if  $x_n \rightarrow x^*$  for any sequence  $\{x_n\}$  such that  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x^*)$  with  $d(x_n, K) \rightarrow 0$ .

**Remark 3.1 :**

If  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ , then well-posedness at a point  $x^* \in \text{Eff}(K, f)$  of the vector optimization problem  $VP(f, K)$  according to definition 3.1 [resp. to def. 3.2] implies well-posedness according to definition 3.3 [ resp. to def. 3.4]

It is easy realize that the pointwise well-posedness of type 3.1 is weaker than pointwise well-posedness of type 3.3 [16].

An useful tool in the study of vector optimization problems is provided by the vector variational inequalities. They, introduced first by Giannessi in 1980 [12], have been studied intensively because they can be efficient tools for investigating vector

optimization problems and also because they provide a mathematical model for equilibrium problems. In this section we deal with vector variational inequalities of differential type.

Let  $f: R^n \rightarrow R^l$  be a function differentiable on an open set containing the closed convex set  $K \subseteq R^n$ . The *vector variational inequality problem of differential type* consists in finding a point  $x^* \in K$  such that:

$$SVVI(f', K) \quad \langle f'(x^*), y - x^* \rangle_l \notin -\text{int } C \\ \forall y \in K$$

where  $f'$  denote the Jacobian of  $f$  and  $\langle f'(x^*), y - x^* \rangle_l$  is the vector whose components are the  $l$  inner products  $\langle f'_i(x^*), y - x^* \rangle$ .

It is well known that  $SVVI(f', K)$  is a necessary condition for  $x^*$  to be an efficient solution of  $VP(f, K)$ . It is, instead, a sufficient condition for  $x^*$  to be an efficient solution of  $VP(f, K)$  if  $f$  is  $\text{int } C$ -convex while, if  $f$  is  $C$ -convex,  $SVVI(f', K)$  is a sufficient condition for  $x^*$  to be an weakly efficient solution of  $VP(f, K)$ . These remarks underline the links between optimal problems and variational inequalities also for vector case. This is a further reason for a suitable definition of well-posedness for a vector variational inequality which could be compared and related to the given definition for vector optimization. We take the condition  $T(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  as an expression of the convergence of the set  $T(\varepsilon)$  to the set of solutions of the variational inequality ( and consequently of the minimum problem). Then, we introduce a notion of well-posedness for the vector variational inequality problem  $SVVI(f', K)$ , obtained by generalizing definition 2.8. We define the following set:

$$T_{c^0}(\varepsilon) := \left\{ x \in K : \langle f'(x), y - x \rangle_l \notin -\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|y - x\| c^0 - \text{int } C, \forall y \in K \right\}$$

where  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $c^0 \in \text{int } C$ .  $T_{c^0}(\varepsilon)$  is a directional generalization of the set  $T(\varepsilon)$  of Section 2, i.e. when  $l = 1$ , the set  $T_{c^0}(\varepsilon)$  reduces to the set  $T(\varepsilon)$ .

**Definition 3.11:** *The variational inequality  $SVVI(f', K)$  is well-posed when, for every  $c^0 \in \text{int } C$ ,  $e(T_{c^0}(\varepsilon), \text{Weff}(K, f)) \rightarrow 0$  where  $e(A_K, A) = \sup_{A_i \in A_K} d(A_i, A)$ .*

The following result states the relationship between well-posed optimization problem and a well-posed variational inequality, in the vector case [27].

**Theorem 3.2:** *If the variational inequality  $SVVI(f', K)$  is well-posed, then problem  $VP(f, K)$  is well-posed.*

For  $C$ -convex functions, in particular, well-posedness of  $VP(f, K)$  and  $SVVI(f', K)$  substantially coincide. To show that, we assume that  $f$  is differentiable on an open set containing  $K$  and we observe that:

**Lemma 1** [6]: *If  $f : R^n \rightarrow R^l$  is  $C$ -convex, then:*

$$T_{c^0} \{ \varepsilon \} := Z_{c^0} \{ \varepsilon \} = \{ x \in K : f(y) - f(x) \notin -\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|y - x\| c^0 - \text{int } C \}$$

**Definition 3.12:** *The function  $f : K \subseteq R^n \rightarrow R^l$  is said to be  $C$ -convex when:*

$$f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) - [\lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y)] \in -C \quad \forall x, y \in K, \\ \forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

**Theorem 3.3** [6]: Let  $f$  be a  $C$ -convex function. Assume that  $c^0 \in \text{int}C$ , and that  $T_{c^0}\{\varepsilon\}$  is bounded for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $SVVI(f', K)$  is well-posed.

Therefore, if  $f$  is a  $C$ -convex function, the well-posedness of  $SVI(f', K)$  is ensured and, that is, by theorem 3.2, substantially coincide with well-posedness of  $VP(f, K)$ .

### 3. Main results

In this section we introduce a generalized variational inequality problem and we link the well-posedness of this problem to pointwise well-posedness of  $VP(f, K)$ . Throughout this section we assume that  $f: R^n \rightarrow R^l$  is differentiable on an open set containing the closed convex set  $K \subseteq R^n$ .

**Definition 4.1:** For a set  $A \subseteq R^l$ , let  $\Delta_A: R^l \rightarrow R \cup \{\pm \infty\}$  be defined as:

$$\Delta_A(y) = d(y, A) - d(y, A^c)$$

where  $d_A(y) = \inf_{a \in A} \|y - a\|$  is the distance from the point  $y$  to the set  $A$ .

Function  $\Delta_A(y)$  is called the *oriented distance* from the point  $y$  to the set  $A$  and it has been introduced in the framework of nonsmooth scalar optimization. While  $d_A(y) = 0$  when  $y \in \text{cl} A$  (the closure of  $A$ ) and positive elsewhere,  $\Delta_A(y) < 0$  for  $y \in \text{int} A$  (the interior of  $A$ ),  $\Delta_A(y) = 0$  for  $y \in \text{bd} A$  (the boundary of  $A$ ) and positive elsewhere.

The main properties of function  $\Delta_A$  are gathered in the following:

**Theorem 4.1** [30]:

i) if  $A \neq \emptyset$  and  $A \neq R^l$  then  $\Delta_A$  is real valued;

- ii)  $\Delta_A$  is 1-Lipschitzian;
- iii)  $\Delta_A(y) < 0 \ \forall y \in \text{int } A$ ,  $\Delta_A(y) = 0 \ \forall y \in \text{bd } A$  and  $\Delta_A(y) > 0 \ \forall y \in \text{int } A^c$ ;
- iv) if  $A$  is closed, then it holds  $A = \{y : \Delta_A(y) \leq 0\}$ ;
- v) if  $A$  is convex, then  $\Delta_A$  is convex;
- vi) if  $A$  is a cone, then  $\Delta_A$  is positively homogeneous;
- vii) if  $A$  is a closed convex cone, then  $\Delta_A$  is non increasing with respect to the ordering relation induced on  $R^l$ , i.e. the following is true:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{if} & y_1, y_2 \in R^l & \text{then} \\ y_1 - y_2 \in A & \Rightarrow \Delta_A(y_1) \leq \Delta_A(y_2) \\ \text{if} & A \text{ has nonempty interior,} & \text{then} \\ y_1 - y_2 \in \text{int } A & \Rightarrow \Delta_A(y_1) < \Delta_A(y_2) \end{array}$$

The oriented distance function  $\Delta_A$ , used also to obtain a scalarization of a vector optimization problem [5],[15],[25], allows to establish a parallelism between the well-posedness of the original vector problem and the well posedness of the associate scalar problem. More precisely, in [25] is shown that every notion of well-posedness in vector optimization can be rephrased as a suitable well-posedness of a corresponding scalar optimization problem.

It has been proved, in [13], that when  $A$  is closed, convex, pointed cone, then we have:

$$\Delta_{-A}(y) = \max_{\xi \in A' \cap S} \langle \xi, y \rangle$$

where  $A' := \{x \in R^l \mid \langle x, a \rangle \geq 0, \forall a \in A\}$  is the positive polar of the cone of  $A$  and  $S$  the unit sphere in  $R^l$ .

We use function  $\Delta_{-A}$  in order to give scalar characterizations of some notions of efficiency for problem  $VP(f, K)$ . Furthermore, some results characterize pointwise well-posedness of problem  $VP(f, K)$  through function  $\Delta_{-A}$  [9].

Given a point  $x^* \in K$ , we consider the function:

$$\varphi_{x^*}(x) = \max_{\xi \in C' \cap S} \langle \xi, f(x) - f(x^*) \rangle$$

where  $C'$  denotes the positive polar of  $C$  and  $S$  the unit sphere in  $R^l$ . Clearly

$$\varphi_{x^*}(x) = \Delta_{-C}(f(x) - f(x^*))$$

The function  $\varphi_{x^*}$  is directionally differentiable [8] and hence we can consider the directional derivative

$$\varphi'_{x^*}(x; d) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi_{x^*}(x + td) - \varphi_{x^*}(x)}{t}$$

and the generalized problem: find  $x^* \in K$ , such that:

$$\begin{aligned} SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K) \quad \varphi'_{x^*}(x^*; y - x^*) \geq 0 \\ \forall y \in K \end{aligned}$$

The solutions of problem  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$  coincide with the solutions of  $SVVI(f', K)$

**Proposition 4.1** [7]: *Let  $K$  be a convex set. If  $x^* \in K$  solves problem  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$  for some  $x^* \in K$ , then  $x^*$  is a solution of  $SVVI(f', K)$ . Conversely, if  $x^* \in K$  solves  $SVVI(f', K)$ , then  $x^*$  solves problem  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$ .*

**Definition 4.2:**  $SVVI(f', K)$  is pointwise well-posed at  $x^* \in K$ , when:

$$i) T_{x^*}(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall y \in K$$

$$ii) \text{diam } T_{x^*}(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{if } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

$$\text{where } T_{x^*}(\varepsilon) = \{x \in K : \varphi'_{x^*}(x, y - x) \geq \varepsilon \|x - y\|, \quad \forall y \in K\}$$

The scalar problem associated with the vector problem  $VP(f, K)$  is:

$$P(\varphi_{x^*}, K) \qquad \min_{x \in K} \varphi_{x^*}(x)$$

The relations among the solutions of problem  $P(\varphi_{x^*}, K)$  and those of problem  $VP(f, K)$  are investigated in [14],[30]. We here refer only to the characterization of weak efficient solution.

**Proposition 4.2:** *The point  $x^* \in K$  is a weak efficient solution of  $VP(f, K)$  if and only if  $x^*$  is a solution of  $P(\varphi_{x^*}, K)$ .*

The proof is omitted and we refer to [6] for details.

Also well-posedness of  $VP(f, K)$  can be linked to that of  $P(\varphi_{x^*}, K)$ .

**Proposition 4.3** [6]: *Let  $f$  be a continuous function and let  $x^* \in K$  be an efficient solution of  $VP(f, K)$ . Problem  $VP(f, K)$  is pointwise well-posed at  $x^*$  if and only if problem  $P(\varphi_{x^*}, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed.*

Next proposition links the well-posedness of  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$  to pointwise well-posedness of  $VP(f, K)$ . We need to recall Ekeland's variational principle[4]: it says that there is a "nearby point" which actually minimizes a slightly perturbed given functional. More precisely it asserts that a particular optimization problem can be replaced by other which is near the original and has a unique solution [26]. In fact, often the mathematical model of a phenomenon is so complicated that is necessary to replace it by other model which has a solution "near" the original one.

### The Ekeland's variational principle

Let  $V$  be a complete metric space with associated metric  $\Delta$ , and let  $F: V \rightarrow R \cup (+\infty)$  be a lower semicontinuous function which is bounded below

If  $u$  is a point in  $V$  satisfying

$$F(u) \leq \inf F + \varepsilon$$

for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then, for every  $\lambda > 0$  there exists a point  $v$  in  $V$  such that:

i)  $F(v) \leq F(u)$

ii)  $\Delta(u, v) \leq \lambda$

iii) For all  $w \neq v$  in  $V$ , one has  $F(v) < F(w) + (\varepsilon / \lambda) \Delta(w, v)$

**Proposition 4.4:** *If  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$  is pointwise well-posed at  $x^* \in K$ , then problem  $VP(f, K)$  is pointwise well-posed at  $x^*$ .*

**Proof:** We know that the vector optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &VP(f, K) && \min_C f(x) \\ &\forall x \in K \end{aligned}$$

is pointwise well-posed at  $x^* \in K$  if and only if problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\varphi_{x^*}, K) && \min \varphi_{x^*}(x) \\ &\forall x \in K \end{aligned}$$

is Tykhonov well-posed.

Then, we prove now that if  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$  is pointwise well-posed at  $x^*$ , then problem  $P(\varphi_{x^*}, K)$  is Tykhonov well-posed.

In fact, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $x \in \varepsilon - \arg \min(\varphi_{x^*}, K)$ , by Ekeland's variational principle, there exist  $\bar{x}$  such that:

$$\|\bar{x} - x\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{x^*}(\bar{x}) \leq \varphi_{x^*}(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \|\bar{x} - y\|$$

$\forall y \in K$ .

If we introduce the set

$$Z(\varepsilon) = \{x \in K : \varphi_{x^*}(x) \leq \varphi_{x^*}(y) + \varepsilon \|x - y\|, \quad \forall y \in K\}$$

then, we have

$$\varepsilon - \arg \min(\varphi_{x^*}, K) \subseteq Z(\varepsilon) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} B.$$

We get, then, that  $\forall u \in \varepsilon - \arg \min(\varphi_{x^*}, K)$  there exist  $x$  such that  $\|u - x\| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$  and

$$\varphi_{x^*}(x+t(y-x)) \geq \varphi_{x^*}(x) - \sqrt{\varepsilon} t \|y-x\|, \quad 0 < t < 1, y \in K$$

Since  $\varphi'_{x^*}(x, y-x) \geq -\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|y-x\|$ , follows  $x \in T_{x^*}(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$  and so:

$$\varepsilon - \arg \min(\varphi_{x^*}, K) \subseteq T_{x^*}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} B$$

Since  $\text{diam} T_{x^*}(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , then we have that  $\varphi_{x^*}$  is Tykhonov well-posed.

Now we prove that the converse of the previous proposition is true if  $f$  is  $C$ -convex. Before, we need the following Lemma:

**Lemma 4.1** [7]: *If  $f: R^n \rightarrow R^l$  is  $C$ -convex function, then the function  $\varphi_{x^*}(x)$ , is convex  $\forall x \in K$ .*

**Proposition 4.5:** *Let  $f$  be  $C$ -convex and assume  $f$  is pointwise well posed at  $x^* \in K$ .*

*Then  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$  is pointwise well-posed at  $x^*$ .*

**Proof :** Since  $f$  is pointwise well-posed, then  $x^*$  solves problem  $VP(f, K)$  and  $x^*$  is a solution of the  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$ . It follows that  $T_{x^*}(\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0$ .

Assuming, ab absurdo, that  $SVVI(\varphi'_{x^*}, K)$  is not pointwise well-posed at  $x^*$ , follows that exist  $a > 0$  and  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ , with  $\text{diam} T_{x^*}(\varepsilon_n) > 2a$  and one can find some  $x_n \in T_{x^*}(\varepsilon_n)$ , with  $\|x_n\| \geq a$ .

Without loss of generality we put  $x^* = 0$ . Since  $\varphi_{x^*}$  is convex, we have:

$$\varphi_{x^*}(0) - \varphi_{x^*}(y_n) \geq \varphi'_{x^*}(y_n, -y_n)$$

where  $y_n = a \frac{x_n}{\|x_n\|}$ . The boundedness of  $y_n$  implies we can assume  $y_n \rightarrow \bar{y} \in K$  (here we need  $K$  closed). Further, since  $x_n \in T_{x^*}(\varepsilon_n)$ , we have

$$\varphi'_{x^*}(x_n, -x_n) \geq -\varepsilon_n \|x_n\|$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_{x^*}(x_n, -x_n) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi_{x^*}(x_n - tx_n) - \varphi_{x^*}(x_n)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\varphi_{x^*}(x_n + (-t)(x_n)) - \varphi_{x^*}(x_n)}{-t} = \\ &= -\varphi'_{x^*}(x_n, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\varphi'_{x^*}(y_n, -y_n) = -\varphi'_{x^*}(y_n, y_n),$$

from the continuity of  $\varphi_{x^*}$  we have

$$\varphi'_{x^*}(y_n, y_n) = \varphi'_{x^*}\left(\frac{ax_n}{\|x_n\|}, \frac{ax_n}{\|x_n\|}\right) \leq \frac{a}{\|x_n\|} \varphi'_{x^*}\left(\frac{ax_n}{\|x_n\|}, x_n\right) \leq \frac{a}{\|x_n\|} \varphi'_{x^*}(x_n, x_n)$$

The last inequality follows from the convexity of  $\varphi_{x^*}$  [29].

Hence

$$-\varphi'_{x^*}(y_n, -y_n) \leq \frac{a}{\|x_n\|} \varphi'_{x^*}(x_n, x_n)$$

it follows

$$\frac{a}{\|x_n\|} \varphi'_{x^*}(x_n, -x_n) \leq \varphi'_{x^*}(y_n, -y_n)$$

and so

$$\varphi_{x^*}(0) - \varphi_{x^*}(y_n) \geq \frac{a}{\|x_n\|} \varphi'_{x^*}(x_n, -x_n) \geq -a\varepsilon_n$$

Sending  $n$  to  $+\infty$  we obtain  $\varphi_{x^0}(0) - \varphi_{x^0}(\bar{y}) \geq 0$  which contradicts to Tykhonov well-posedness.



## References

- [1] Baiocchi C. and Capelo A.: *Variational and Quasivariational inequalities: application to free boundary problems*, J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1984.
- [2] Bednarczuk E. and Penot J.P.: *On the positions of the notions of well-posed minimization problems*, Bollettino U. M. I., vol.7, 1992.
- [3] Bednarczuk E.: *Well posedness of vector optimization problems*. Recent advances and historical development of vector optimization problems, edited by Jahn J., Krabs W. Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical System vol. 294. Springer- Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [4] Clarke Frank A.: *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis* Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, 1990.
- [5] Crespi G.- Ginchev I.- Rocca M.: *Increase-along-rays property for vector function*, submitted.
- [6] Crespi G - Guerraggio A - Rocca M.: *Well-posedness in vector optimization problem and vector variational inequalities*, submitted.
- [7] Crespi G.- Ginchev I.- Rocca M.: *Variational inequalities in vector optimization: Variational Analysis and Application*, Series: Nonconvex Optimization and its Application. Eds. F.Giannessi; A. Maugeri, Vol.79, 2005, Parte II.
- [8] Demyanov V. F.- Rubinov A. M.: *Constructive nonsmooth analysis*, Approximation & Optimization 7, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1995.
- [9] Dentcheva D. and Helbig S. : *On variational principles, level sets, well-posedness and  $\varepsilon$ -solutions in vector optimization*. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, vol. 89, 1996.

- [10] Dontchev A.L. and Zolezzi T.: *Well-posed optimization problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1543, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [11] Ekeland I.-Téman R.: *Convex analysis and variational problems*. Translated from the French. Corrected reprint of the 1976 English edition. Classics in Applied Mathematics, 28. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1999.
- [12] Giannessi F.: *Theorems of the alternative quadratic programs and complementary problems*, Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problem. Theory and Applications. Wiley, New York, 1980.
- [13] Ginchev I.- Hoffmann A.: *Approximation of set-valued functions by single-valued one*. Discuss. Math. Differ. Incl. Control Optim. 22, 2002.
- [14] Ginchev I.-Guerraggio A.-Rocca M.:*First-order conditions for  $C^{0,1}$  constrained vector optimization*, Variational analysis and Application, Series: Nonconvex Optimization and its Application. Eds. F. Giannessi; A. Maugeri Vol.79 2005, Parte II.
- [15] Gorohovik V.V.: *Convex and nonmooth optimization ( in Russiam)* Navuka I Tèkhnika, 240, Minsk, 1990.
- [16] Huang X.X.: *Pointwise well-posedness of perturbed vector optimization problems in a vector-valued variational principle*. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, vol.108 , 2001.
- [17] Kinderlehrer D. – Stampacchia G.: *An introduction to variational inequalities and their applications*, Pure and Applied Math. Academ Press, vol.88, 1980
- [18] Levitin E.S. and PolyaK B.T.: *Convergence of minimizing sequences in conditional extremum problems*, Soviet Math. Dokl. 7,1996.

- [19] Lignola B. and Morgan J.: *Approximate solutions and  $\alpha$  – well-posedness for variational inequalities and Nash equilibria*, in Decision and Control in Management Science, Kluwer Academic Publisher, 2002.
- [20] Loridan P.: *Well-posedness in vector optimization*. Recent developments in well-posed variational problems, eds by Lucchetti R., Revolskyi J. Serie M.I.A. vol. 331, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1995
- [21] Lucchetti R.. *Well-posedness towards vector optimization*, Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems vol. 294, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [22] Lucchetti R. and Patrone F.: *Hadamard and Tykhonov well-posedness of a certain class of convex function*. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications vol. 88, 1982.
- [23] Lucchetti R. and Patrone F.: *A characterization of Tykhonov well-posedness for minimum problems, with applications to variational inequalities*, Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization, vol. 3, 1981.
- [24] Lucchetti R. and Patrone F.: *Some aspects of the connection between Hadamard and Tykhonov well-posedness of convex problems*, Bollettino U.M.I. sez. C,6,1982.
- [25] Miglierina E.-Molho E.-Rocca M.: *Well-posedness and Scalarization in vector optimization*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 126, 2005.
- [26] Revalski J.P.: *Generic well-posedness in some classes of optimization problems*, Acta University Carolinae: Mathematica et Physica, vol. 28, 1987
- [27] Revalski J.P.: *Well-posedness of Optimization Problem: a survey*, Functional Analysis and Approximation, edited by P.L. Papini, Bagni di Lucca, 1988.

- [28] Revalski J.P.: *Various aspects of well-posedness of optimization problems*. Recent Developments in well-posed variational problems, eds R.Lucchetti - J. Revalski, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands 1995.
- [29] Rockafellar R.T.: *Convex analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1997
- [30] Zaffaroni A.: *Degrees of efficiency and degrees of minimality*, S.I.A.M. Journal Control of Optimization, vol. 42, 2003.
- [31] Zaslavski A.J.: *Generic well-posedness of Optimal Control problems without convexity assumptions*, SIAM. Journal on Control and Optimization vol. 39, 2000.
- [32] Zaslavski A.J.: *Generic well-posedness of variational problems without convexity assumptions*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application vol. 279, 2003.
- [33] Zolezzi T. : *Well-posedness criteria in optimization with application to the calculus of variations*, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications, vol. 25, 1995.

WORKING PAPERS DEL DIPARTIMENTO

- 1988, 3.1 Guido CELLA  
*Linkages e moltiplicatori input-output.*
- 1989, 3.2 Marco MUSELLA  
*La moneta nei modelli di inflazione da conflitto.*
- 1989, 3.3 Floro E. CAROLEO  
*Le cause economiche nei differenziali regionali del tasso di disoccupazione.*
- 1989, 3.4 Luigi ACCARINO  
*Attualità delle illusioni finanziarie nella moderna società.*
- 1989, 3.5 Sergio CESARATTO  
*La misurazione delle risorse e dei risultati delle attività innovative: una valutazione dei risultati dell'indagine CNR- ISTAT sull'innovazione tecnologica.*
- 1990, 3.6 Luigi ESPOSITO - Pasquale PERSICO  
*Sviluppo tecnologico ed occupazionale: il caso Italia negli anni '80.*
- 1990, 3.7 Guido CELLA  
*Matrici di contabilità sociale ed analisi ambientale.*
- 1990, 3.8 Guido CELLA  
*Linkages e input-output: una nota su alcune recenti critiche.*
- 1990, 3.9 Concetto Paolo VINCI  
*I modelli econometrici sul mercato del lavoro in Italia.*
- 1990, 3.10 Concetto Paolo VINCI  
*Il dibattito sul tasso di partecipazione in Italia: una rivisitazione a 20 anni di distanza.*
- 1990, 3.11 Giuseppina AUTIERO  
*Limiti della coerenza interna ai modelli con la R.E.H..*
- 1990, 3.12 Gaetano Fausto ESPOSITO  
*Evoluzione nei distretti industriali e domanda di istituzione.*
- 1990, 3.13 Guido CELLA  
*Measuring spatial linkages: input-output and shadow prices.*
- 1990, 3.14 Emanuele SALSANO  
*Seminari di economia.*

- 1990, 3.15 Emanuele SALSANO  
*Investimenti, valore aggiunto e occupazione in Italia in contesto biregionale: una prima analisi dei dati 1970/1982.*
- 1990, 3.16 Alessandro PETRETTO- Giuseppe PISAURO  
*Uniformità vs selettività nella teoria della ottima tassazione e dei sistemi tributari ottimali.*
- 1990, 3.17 Adalgiso AMENDOLA  
*Inflazione, disoccupazione e aspettative. Aspetti teorici dell'introduzione di aspettative endogene nel dibattito sulla curva di Phillips.*
- 1990, 3.18 Pasquale PERSICO  
*Il Mezzogiorno e le politiche di sviluppo industriale.*
- 1990, 3.19 Pasquale PERSICO  
*Priorità delle politiche strutturali e strategie di intervento.*
- 1990, 3.20 Adriana BARONE - Concetto Paolo VINCI  
*La produttività nella curva di Phillips.*
- 1990, 3.21 Emiddio GALLO  
*Varianze ed invarianze socio-spaziali nella transizione demografica dell'Italia post-industriale.*
- 1991, 3.22 Alfonso GAMBARDELLA  
*I gruppi etnici in Nicaragua. Autonomia politica ed economica.*
- 1991, 3.23 Maria SCATTAGLIA  
*La stima empirica dell'offerta di lavoro in Italia: una rassegna.*
- 1991, 3.24 Giuseppe CELI  
*La teoria delle aree valutarie: una rassegna.*
- 1991, 3.25 Paola ADINOLFI  
*Relazioni industriali e gestione delle risorse umane nelle imprese italiane.*
- 1991, 3.26 Antonio e Bruno PELOSI  
*Sviluppo locale ed occupazione giovanile: nuovi bisogni formativi.*
- 1991, 3.27 Giuseppe MARIGLIANO  
*La formazione del prezzo nel settore dell'intermediazione commerciale.*
- 1991, 3.28 Maria PROTO  
*Risorse naturali, merci e ambiente: il caso dello zolfo.*
- 1991, 3.29 Salvatore GIORDANO  
*Ricerca sullo stato dei servizi nelle industrie del salernitano.*

- 1992, 3.30 Antonio LOPES  
*Crisi debitoria e politiche macroeconomiche nei paesi in via di sviluppo negli anni 80.*
- 1992, 3.31 Antonio VASSILLO  
*Circuiti economici semplici, complessi, ed integrati.*
- 1992, 3.32 Gaetano Fausto ESPOSITO  
*Imprese ed istituzioni nel Mezzogiorno: spunti analitici e modalità di relazione.*
- 1992, 3.33 Paolo COCCORESE  
*Un modello per l'analisi del sistema pensionistico.*
- 1994, 3.34 Aurelio IORI  
*Il comparto dei succhi di agrumi: un caso di analisi interorganizzativa.*
- 1994, 3.35 Nicola POSTIGLIONE  
*Analisi multicriterio e scelte pubbliche.*
- 1994, 3.36 Adriana BARONE  
*Cooperazione nel dilemma del prigioniero ripetuto e disoccupazione involontaria.*
- 1994, 3.37 Adriana BARONE  
*Le istituzioni come regolarità di comportamento.*
- 1994, 3.38 Maria Giuseppina LUCIA  
*Lo sfruttamento degli idrocarburi offshore tra sviluppo economico e tutela dell'ambiente.*
- 1994, 3.39 Giuseppina AUTIERO  
*Un'analisi di alcuni dei limiti strutturali alle politiche di stabilizzazione nei LCDs.*
- 1994, 3.40 Bruna BRUNO  
*Modelli di contrattazione salariale e ruolo del sindacato.*
- 1994, 3.41 Giuseppe CELI  
*Cambi reali e commercio estero: una riflessione sulle recenti interpretazioni teoriche.*
- 1995, 3.42 Alessandra AMENDOLA, M. Simona ANDREANO  
*The TAR models: an application on italian financial time series.*
- 1995, 3.43 Leopoldo VARRIALE  
*Ambiente e turismo: Parco dell'Iguazù - Argentina.*

- 1995, 3.44 A. PELOSI, R. LOMBARDI  
*Fondi pensione: equilibrio economico-finanziario delle imprese.*
- 1995, 3.45 Emanuele SALSANO, Domenico IANNONE  
*Economia e struttura produttiva nel salernitano dal secondo dopoguerra ad oggi.*
- 1995, 3.46 Michele LA ROCCA  
*Empirical likelihood and linear combinations of functions of order statistics.*
- 1995, 3.47 Michele LA ROCCA  
*L'uso del bootstrap nella verosimiglianza empirica.*
- 1996, 3.48 Domenico RANESI  
*Le politiche CEE per lo sviluppo dei sistemi locali: esame delle diverse tipologie di intervento e tentativo di specificazione tassonomica.*
- 1996, 3.49 Michele LA ROCCA  
*L'uso della verosimiglianza empirica per il confronto di due parametri di posizione.*
- 1996, 3.50 Massimo SPAGNOLO  
*La domanda dei prodotti della pesca in Italia.*
- 1996, 3.51 Cesare IMBRIANI, Filippo REGANATI  
*Macroeconomic stability and economic integration. The case of Italy.*
- 1996, 3.52 Annarita GERMANI  
*Gli effetti della mobilitazione della riserva obbligatoria. Analisi sull'efficienza del suo utilizzo.*
- 1996, 3.53 Massimo SPAGNOLO  
*A model of fish price formation in the north sea and the Mediterranean.*
- 1996, 3.54 Fernanda MAZZOTTA  
*RTFL: problemi e soluzioni per i dati Panel.*
- 1996, 3.55 Angela SPAGNUOLO  
*Concentrazione industriale e dimensione del mercato: il ruolo della spesa per pubblicità e R&D.*
- 1996, 3.56 Giuseppina AUTIERO  
*The economic case for social norms.*
- 1996, 3.57 Francesco GIORDANO  
*Sulla convergenza degli stimatori Kernel.*
- 1996, 3.58 Tullio JAPPELLI, Marco PAGANO  
*The determinants of saving: lessons from Italy.*

- 1997, 3.59 Tullio JAPPELLI  
*The age-wealth profile and the life-cycle hypothesis: a cohort analysis with a time series of cross sections of Italian households.*
- 1997, 3.60 Marco Antonio MONACO  
*La gestione dei servizi di pubblico interesse.*
- 1997, 3.61 Marcella ANZOLIN  
*L'albero della qualità dei servizi pubblici locali in Italia: metodologie e risultati conseguiti.*
- 1997, 3.62 Cesare IMBRIANI, Antonio LOPES  
*Intermediazione finanziaria e sistema produttivo in un'area dualistica. Uno studio di caso.*
- 1997, 3.63 Tullio JAPPELLI  
*Risparmio e liberalizzazione finanziaria nell'Unione europea.*
- 1997, 3.64 Alessandra AMENDOLA  
*Analisi dei dati di sopravvivenza.*
- 1997, 3.65 Francesco GIORDANO, Cira PERNA  
*Gli stimatori Kernel per la stima non parametrica della funzione di regressione.*
- 1997, 3.66 Biagio DI SALVIA  
*Le relazioni marittimo-commerciali nell'imperiale regio litorale austriaco nella prima metà dell'800.*  
*I. Una riclassificazione delle Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie.*
- 1997, 3.67 Alessandra AMENDOLA  
*Modelli non lineari di seconda e terza generazione: aspetti teorici ed evidenze empiriche.*
- 1998, 3.68 Vania SENA  
*L'analisi econometrica dell'efficienza tecnica. Un'applicazione agli ospedali italiani di zona.*
- 1998, 3.69 Domenico CERBONE  
*Investimenti irreversibili.*
- 1998, 3.70 Antonio GAROFALO  
*La riduzione dell'orario di lavoro è una soluzione al problema disoccupazione: un tentativo di analisi empirica.*
- 1998, 3.71 Jacqueline MORGAN, Roberto RAUCCI  
*New convergence results for Nash equilibria.*

- 1998, 3.72 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Niels Henrik Abel e le equazioni algebriche.*
- 1998, 3.73 Marco MICOCCI, Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Un approccio markoviano al problema della valutazione delle opzioni.*
- 1998, 3.74 Rosa FERRENTINO, Ciro CALABRESE  
*Rango di una matrice di dimensione K.*
- 1999, 3.75 Patrizia RIGANTI  
*L'uso della valutazione contingente per la gestione del patrimonio culturale: limiti e potenzialità.*
- 1999, 3.76 Annamaria NESE  
*Il problema dell'inefficienza nel settore dei musei: tecniche di valutazione.*
- 1999, 3.77 Gianluigi COPPOLA  
*Disoccupazione e mercato del lavoro: un'analisi su dati provinciali.*
- 1999, 3.78 Alessandra AMENDOLA  
*Un modello soglia con eteroschedasticità condizionata per tassi di cambio.*
- 1999, 3.79 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Su un'applicazione della trasformata di Laplace al calcolo della funzione asintotica di non rovina.*
- 1999, 3.80 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Un'applicazione della trasformata di Laplace nel caso di una distribuzione di Erlang.*
- 1999, 3.81 Angela SPAGNUOLO  
*Efficienza e struttura degli incentivi nell'azienda pubblica: il caso dell'industria sanitaria.*
- 1999, 3.82 Antonio GAROFALO, Cesare IMBRIANI, Concetto Paolo VINCI  
*Youth unemployment: an insider-outsider dynamic approach.*
- 1999, 3.83 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Un modello per la determinazione del tasso di riequilibrio in un progetto di fusione tra banche.*
- 1999, 3.84 DE STEFANIS, PORZIO  
*Assessing models in frontier analysis through dynamic graphics.*
- 1999, 3.85 Annunziato GESUALDI  
*Infazione e analisi delle politiche fiscali nell'U.E..*
- 1999, 3.86 R. RAUCCI, L. TADDEO  
*Dalle equazioni differenziali alle funzioni  $e^x$ ,  $\log x$ ,  $a^x$ ,  $\log_a x$ ,  $x^\alpha$ .*

- 1999, 3.87 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Sulla determinazione di numeri aleatori generati da equazioni algebriche.*
- 1999, 3.88 C. PALMISANI, R. RAUCCI  
*Sulle funzioni circolari: una presentazione non classica.*
- 2000, 3.89 Giuseppe STORTI, Pierluigi FURCOLO, Paolo VILLANI  
*A dynamic generalized linear model for precipitation forecasting.*
- 2000, 3.90 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Un procedimento risolutivo per l'equazione di Dickson.*
- 2000, 3.91 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Un'applicazione della mistura di esponenziali alla teoria del rischio.*
- 2000, 3.92 Francesco GIORDANO, Michele LA ROCCA, Cira PERNA  
*Bootstrap variance estimates for neural networks regression models.*
- 2000, 3.93 Alessandra AMENDOLA, Giuseppe STORTI  
*A non-linear time series approach to modelling asymmetry in stock market indexes.*
- 2000, 3.94 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Sopra un'osservazione di De Vylder.*
- 2000, 3.95 Massimo SALZANO  
*Reti neurali ed efficacia dell'intervento pubblico: previsioni dell'inquinamento da traffico nell'area di Villa S. Giovanni.*
- 2000, 3.96 Angela SPAGNUOLO  
*Concorrenza e deregolamentazione nel mercato del trasporto aereo in Italia.*
- 2000, 3.97 Roberto RAUCCI, Luigi TADDEO  
*Teoremi ingannevoli.*
- 2000, 3.98 Francesco GIORDANO  
*Una procedura per l'inizializzazione dei pesi delle reti neurali per l'analisi del trend.*
- 2001, 3.99 Angela D'ELIA  
*Some methodological issues on multivariate modelling of rank data.*
- 2001, 3.100 Roberto RAUCCI, Luigi TADDEO  
*Nuove classi di funzioni scalari quasiconcave generalizzate: caratterizzazioni ed applicazioni a problemi di ottimizzazione.*
- 2001, 3.101 Adriana BARONE, Annamaria NESE  
*Some insights into night work in Italy.*
- 2001, 3.102 Alessandra AMENDOLA, Marcella NIGLIO

*Predictive distributions of nonlinear time series models.*

- 2001, 3.103 Roberto RAUCCI  
*Sul concetto di certo equivalente nella teoria HSSB.*
- 2001, 3.104 Roberto RAUCCI, Luigi TADDEO  
*On stackelberg games: a result of unicity.*
- 2001, 3.105 Roberto RAUCCI  
*Una definizione generale e flessibile di insieme limitato superiormente in  $\mathfrak{R}^n$*
- 2001, 3.106 Roberto RAUCCI  
*Stretta quasiconcavità nelle forme funzionali flessibili.*
- 2001, 3.107 Roberto RAUCCI  
*Sugli insiemi limitati in  $\mathfrak{R}^m$  rispetto ai coni.*
- 2001, 3.108 Roberto RAUCCI  
*Monotonie, isotonie e indecomponibilità deboli per funzioni a valori vettoriali con applicazioni.*
- 2001, 3.109 Roberto RAUCCI  
*Generalizzazioni del concetto di debole Kuhn-Tucker punto-sella.*
- 2001, 3.110 Antonia Rosa GURRIERI, Marilene LORIZIO  
*Le determinanti dell'efficienza nel settore sanitario. Uno studio applicato.*
- 2001, 3.111 Gianluigi COPPOLA  
*Studio di una provincia meridionale attraverso un'analisi dei sistemi locali del lavoro. Il caso di Salerno.*
- 2001, 3.112 Francesco GIORDANO  
*Reti neurali per l'analisi del trend: un approccio per identificare la topologia della rete.*
- 2001, 3.113 Marcella NIGLIO  
*Nonlinear time series models with switching structure: a comparison of their forecast performances.*
- 2001, 3.114 Damiano FIORILLO  
*Capitale sociale e crescita economica. Review dei concetti e dell'evidenza empirica.*
- 2001, 3.115 Roberto RAUCCI, Luigi TADDEO  
*Generalizzazione del concetto di continuità e di derivabilità.*
- 2001, 3.116 Marcella NIGLIO  
*Ricostruzione dei dati mancanti in serie storiche climatiche.*

- 2001, 3.117 Vincenzo VECCHIONE  
*Mutamenti del sistema creditizio in un'area periferica.*
- 2002, 3.118 Francesco GIORDANO, Michele LA ROCCA, Cira PERNA  
*Bootstrap variable selection in neural network regression models.*
- 2002, 3.119 Roberto RAUCCI, Luigi TADDEO  
*Insiemi debolmente convessi e concavità in senso generale.*
- 2002, 3.120 Vincenzo VECCHIONE  
*Know how locali e percorsi di sviluppo in aree e settori marginali.*
- 2002, 3.121 Michele LA ROCCA, Cira PERNA  
*Neural networks with dependent data.*
- 2002, 3.122 Pietro SENESI  
*Economic dynamics: theory and policy. A stability analysis approach.*
- 2002, 3.123 Gianluigi COPPOLA  
*Stima di un indicatore di pressione ambientale: un'applicazione ai comuni della Campania.*
- 2002, 3.124 Roberto RAUCCI  
*Sull'esistenza di autovalori e autovettori positivi anche nel caso non lineare.*
- 2002, 3.125 Maria Carmela MICCOLI  
*Identikit di giovani lucani.*
- 2002, 3.126 Sergio DESTEFANIS, Giuseppe STORTI  
*Convexity, productivity change and the economic performance of countries.*
- 2002, 3.127 Giovanni C. PORZIO, Maria Prosperina VITALE  
*Esplorare la non linearità nei modelli Path.*
- 2002, 3.128 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*Sulla funzione di Seal.*
- 2003, 3.129 Michele LA ROCCA, Cira PERNA  
*Identificazione del livello intermedio nelle reti neurali di tipo feedforward.*
- 2003, 3.130 Alessandra AMENDOLA, Marcella NIGLIO, Cosimo VITALE  
*The exact multi-step ahead predictor of SETARMA models.*
- 2003, 3.131 Mariangela BONASIA  
*La dimensione ottimale di un sistema pensionistico: means tested vs programma universale.*
- 2003, 3.132 Annamaria NESE  
*Abitazione e famiglie a basso reddito.*

- 2003, 3.133 Maria Lucia PARRELLA  
*Le proprietà asintotiche del Local Polynomial Bootstrap.*
- 2003, 3.134 Silvio GIOVE, Maurizio NORDIO, Stefano SILVONI  
*Stima della prevalenza dell'insufficienza renale cronica con reti bayesiane: analisi costo efficacia delle strategie di prevenzione secondaria.*
- 2003, 3.135 Massimo SALZANO  
*Globalization, complexity and the holism of the italian school of public finance.*
- 2003, 3.136 Giuseppina AUTIERO  
*Labour market institutional systems and unemployment performance in some Oecd countries.*
- 2003, 3.137 Marisa FAGGINI  
*Recurrence analysis for detecting non-stationarity and chaos in economic times series.*
- 2003, 3.138 Marisa FAGGINI, Massimo SALZANO  
*The reverse engineering of economic systems. Tools and methodology.*
- 2003, 3.139 Rosa FERRENTINO  
*In corso di pubblicazione.*
- 2003, 3.140 Rosa FERRENTINO, Roberto RAUCCI  
*Sui problemi di ottimizzazione in giochi di Stackelberg ed applicazioni in modelli economici.*
- 2003, 3.141 Carmine SICA  
*In corso di pubblicazione.*
- 2004, 3.142 Sergio DESTEFANIS, Antonella TADDEO, Maurizio TORNATORE  
*The stock of human capital in the Italian regions.*
- 2004, 3.143 Elena Laureana DEL MERCATO  
*Edgeworth equilibria with private provision of public good.*
- 2004, 3.144 Elena Laureana DEL MERCATO  
*Externalities on consumption sets in general equilibrium.*
- 2004, 3.145 Rosa FERRENTINO, Roberto RAUCCI  
*Su alcuni criteri delle serie a termini non negativi.*
- 2004, 3.146 Rosa FERRENTINO, Roberto RAUCCI  
*Legame tra le soluzioni di Minty e di Stempacenhia nelle disequazioni variazionali.*

- 2004, 3.147 Gianluigi COPPOLA  
*In corso di pubblicazione.*
- 2004, 3.148 Massimo Spagnolo  
*The Importance of Economic Incentives in Fisheries Management*
- 2004, 3.149 F. Salsano  
*La politica monetaria in presenza di non perfetta osservabilità degli obiettivi del banchiere centrale.*
- 2004, 3.150 A. Vita  
*La dinamica del cambiamento nella rappresentazione del territorio. Una mappa per i luoghi della Valle dell'Irno.*
- 2004, 3.151 Celi  
*Empirical Explanation of vertical and horizontal intra-industry trade in the UK: a comment.*
- 2004, 3.152 Amendola – P. Vitale  
*Self-Assessment and Career Choices: An On-line resource for the University of Salerno.*
- 2004, 3.153 A. Amendola – R. Troisi  
*Introduzione all'economia politica dell'organizzazione: nozioni ed applicazioni.*
- 2004, 3.154 A. Amendola – R. Troisi  
*Strumenti d'incentivo e modelli di gestione del personale volontario nelle organizzazioni non profit.*
- 2004, 3.155 Lavinia Parisi  
*La gestione del personale nelle imprese manifatturiere della provincia di Salerno.*
- 2004, 3.156 Angela Spagnuolo – Silvia Keller  
*La rete di accesso all'ultimo miglio: una valutazione sulle tecnologie alternative.*
- 2005, 3.157 Davide Cantarelli  
*Elasticities of Complementarity and Substitution in Some Functional Forms. A Comparative Review.*
- 2005, 3.158 Pietro Coretto – Giuseppe Storti  
*Subjective Expectations in Economics: a Statistical overview of the main findings.*
- 2005, 3.159 Pietro Coretto – Giuseppe Storti  
*Moments based inference in small samples.*

- 2005, 3.160 Massimo Salzano  
*Una simulazione neo-keynesiana ad agenti eterogeni.*
- 2005, 3.161 Rosa Ferrentino  
*Su alcuni paradossi della teoria degli insiemi.*
- 2005, 3.162 Damiano Fiorillo  
*Capitale sociale: uno o molti? Pochi.*
- 2005, 3.163 Damiano Fiorillo  
*Il capitale sociale conta per outcomes (macro) economici?.*
- 2005, 3.164 Damiano Fiorillo – Guadalupi Luigi  
*Attività economiche nel distretto industriale di Nocera inferiore – Gragnano.  
Un'analisi su Dati Tagliacarne.*