

On Optimality Conditions for Cone-Constrained Optimization¹

A. F. Izmailov²

Moscow State University, Dept. of Computational Mathematics and Cybernetics

Vorob'yovi Gori, 119899 Moscow, Russia

izmaf@ccas.ru

and

M. V. Solodov³

Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada

Estrada Dona Castorina 110, Jardim Botânico, Rio de Janeiro, RJ 22460-320, Brazil

solodov@impa.br

Abstract

We consider feasible sets given by conic constraints, where the cone defining the constraints is convex with nonempty interior. We study the case where the feasible set is not assumed to be regular in the classical sense of Robinson and obtain a constructive description of the tangent cone under a certain new second-order regularity condition. This condition contains classical regularity as a special case, while being weaker when constraints are twice differentiable. Assuming that the cone defining the constraints is finitely generated, we also derive a special form of primal-dual optimality conditions for the corresponding constrained optimization problem. Our results subsume optimality conditions for both the classical regular and second-order regular cases, while still being meaningful in the more general setting in the sense that the multiplier associated with the objective function is nonzero.

1 Introduction

Let X and Y be normed linear spaces. We consider the sets given by

$$D = \{x \in X \mid F(x) \in K\}, \quad (1)$$

where the constraint mapping $F : X \rightarrow Y$ is smooth enough and K is a closed convex cone in Y with nonempty interior. The problem of an accurate and constructive description of the tangent cone to a set at

a given point is fundamental for many reasons, one of which is deriving optimality conditions. Recall that a vector $h \in X$ is called *tangent* to a set $D \subset X$ at a point $\bar{x} \in D$ if there exists a mapping $r : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow X$ such that $\bar{x} + th + r(t) \in D \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\|r(t)\| = o(t)$. The set of all such vectors h in X is the *tangent cone* to the set D at the point \bar{x} , which we shall denote by $T_D(\bar{x})$. As is well known,

$$T_D(\bar{x}) \subset \{h \in X \mid F'(\bar{x})h \in T_K(F(\bar{x}))\}, \quad (2)$$

which is the first-order necessary condition for tangency. To obtain a *precise* description of $T_D(\bar{x})$, i.e., a sufficient condition for tangency, some regularity (also called constraint qualification) condition is needed. One classical condition in this setting is Robinson's condition:

$$0 \in \text{int}(F(\bar{x}) + \text{Im } F'(\bar{x}) - K). \quad (3)$$

Note that in (3) cone K is not required to have a nonempty interior. If (3) is satisfied, then (2) holds as an equality, e.g., [4, Corollary 2.91]. Deriving an accurate constructive description of the tangent cone without assuming (3) and, more generally, when (2) does not necessarily hold as an equality, is one of the principal goals of this paper. Our approach is based on a certain new notion of second-order regularity, which in the setting of K with nonempty interior is weaker than (3); see Definition 2.1 and Remark 2.1. An immediate application of this description is the primal form of necessary optimality conditions for the problem

$$\min \{f(x) \mid x \in D\}, \quad (4)$$

where the objective function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth enough.

Our second goal is to obtain primal-dual optimality conditions for the irregular case, with a nonzero multiplier associated to the objective function. If \bar{x} is a

¹This is a shortened conference proceedings version of [6].

²The research of this author was supported by Russian Foundation for Basic Research grant 01-01-00810. The author also thanks IMPA where he was a visiting professor during the completion of this work.

³The research of this author was supported in part by CNPq grant 300734/95-6, by PRONEX–Optimization, and by FAPERJ.

local solution of (4), (1), then the classical F. John-type first-order necessary optimality conditions state that there exists a generalized Lagrange multiplier $(y_0, y^*) \in (\mathbb{R} \times Y^*) \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} y_0 f'(\bar{x}) - (F'(\bar{x}))^* y^* &= 0, \\ F(\bar{x}) \in K, y^* \in K^*, \langle y^*, F(\bar{x}) \rangle &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where Y^* is the dual space of Y , $(F'(\bar{x}))^*$ is the adjoint operator of $F'(\bar{x})$, and K^* is the dual cone of K . If Robinson's condition (3) is violated, then the F. John conditions hold trivially with $y_0 = 0$, independently of the objective function, and therefore their utility for describing optimality in that case is very limited (at least without some further developments). Assumptions that guarantee the existence of a multiplier (y_0, y^*) with $y_0 \neq 0$ are again constraint qualification conditions, such as (3). For problems with a finitely generated cone K , without assuming (3) or equality in (2), we obtain a special form of primal-dual optimality conditions under our assumption of second-order regularity. Our optimality conditions resemble the structure of (5), where $y_0 \neq 0$ and a certain term involving the second derivative of F is added to the standard Lagrangian; see Theorem 3.2. Our optimality conditions subsume those for the classical regular case of (3), as well as those for the more general second-order regular case of [3]; see section 4.

In section 4, we compare our results with other approaches relevant for irregular inequality-constrained problems. We also provide an example showing that our results can be used to verify optimality in cases where other known approaches appear not to be applicable.

Finally, we note that in the case of the nonlinear programming problem, i.e., when $Y = \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^s$ and $K = \mathbb{R}_-^m \times \{0\}$, Robinson's regularity condition (3) reduces to the classical Mangasarian–Fromovitz constraint qualification, and with $y_0 \neq 0$ optimality conditions (5) become the classical Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions.

Our notation is fairly standard. If Σ is a topological linear space, then Σ^* denotes its (topologically) dual space and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the pairing of elements in Σ^* and Σ , i.e., $\langle \sigma^*, \sigma \rangle$ is the value of the linear functional $\sigma^* \in \Sigma^*$ on $\sigma \in \Sigma$. For a cone C in Σ , the positive dual cone (sometimes also referred to as the polar cone) of C is $C^* := \{\sigma^* \in \Sigma^* \mid \langle \sigma^*, \sigma \rangle \geq 0 \ \forall \sigma \in C\}$. For an arbitrary set Ω in Σ , the set orthogonal to Ω is $\Omega^\perp := \{\sigma^* \in \Sigma^* \mid \langle \sigma^*, \sigma \rangle = 0 \ \forall \sigma \in \Omega\}$. If Υ and Σ are topological linear spaces and $\Lambda : \Upsilon \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a continuous linear operator, then $\Lambda^* : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Upsilon^*$ denotes the adjoint operator of Λ . The interior and the closure of a set Ω (in appropriate topology) are denoted by $\text{int } \Omega$ and $\text{cl } \Omega$, respectively, and linear and conic hulls of this set (in appropriate linear space) by $\text{lin } \Omega$ and

cone Ω , respectively. A cone C in a linear space Σ is referred to as finitely generated if either it is empty or there exists a positive integer s and some elements $\sigma^i \in \Sigma$, $i = 1, \dots, s$, such that $\text{cl } C = \text{cone}\{\sigma^1, \dots, \sigma^s\} \cup \{0\}$.

2 Tangent cone description

As is well known [4, Lemma 2.99], in our setting where $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$, Robinson's regularity condition (3) is equivalent to

$$\exists \bar{\xi} \in X \text{ such that } F(\bar{x}) + F'(\bar{x})\bar{\xi} \in \text{int } K. \quad (6)$$

This condition implies that for $h \in T_D(\bar{x})$ the inclusion

$$F'(\bar{x})h \in T_K(F(\bar{x})) = \text{cl}(K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\}) \quad (7)$$

is both necessary and sufficient, e.g., [4, Corollary 2.91]. In the irregular case, $T_D(\bar{x})$ can be smaller than the set of $h \in X$ satisfying (7), and a more refined description is needed. To this end, it is natural to take into account the second-order information about F at \bar{x} . We proceed with a second-order characterization of the tangent cone, starting with the following definition.

Definition 2.1 *We say that conic constraints in (1) are second-order regular at a feasible point \bar{x} with respect to a direction $h \in X$ if there exist $(\bar{\xi}, \bar{h}) \in X \times X$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{x}) + F'(\bar{x})\bar{h} &\in K, \\ F(\bar{x}) + F'(\bar{x})\bar{\xi} + F''(\bar{x})[h, \bar{h}] &\in \text{int } K. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1 If Robinson's condition (6) is satisfied, then second-order regularity holds with respect to *every* $h \in X$, including $h = 0$. (To verify this, just choose $\bar{\xi}$ satisfying (6) and $\bar{h} = 0$.)

Observe further that Definition 2.1 is equivalent to saying that there exists $\bar{h} \in X$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} F'(\bar{x})\bar{h} &\in K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\}, \\ F''(\bar{x})[h, \bar{h}] &\in \text{int } K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\} + \text{Im } F'(\bar{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This form of second-order regularity will be used in the subsequent analysis. We are now ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.1 *Let X and Y be normed linear spaces and let K be a closed convex cone in Y with a nonempty interior. Let set D be given by (1), where $F : X \rightarrow Y$ is twice Fréchet-differentiable at a point $\bar{x} \in D$. Then the following statements hold.*

1. Every $h \in T_D(\bar{x})$ satisfies (7) as well as the following condition:

$$F''(\bar{x})[h]^2 \in \text{cl}(K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\} + \text{Im } F'(\bar{x})). \quad (9)$$

2. If $h \in X$ satisfies

$$F'(\bar{x})h \in K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\} \quad (10)$$

and (9), and if constraints in (1) are second-order regular at \bar{x} with respect to this h , then $h \in T_D(\bar{x})$.

In section 4, we compare this theorem (as well as the other results of this paper) with related facts and approaches to irregular inequality constraints and provide an illustrative example. Here, we note that in the regular case (3) implies that

$$K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\} + \text{Im } F'(\bar{x}) = Y,$$

and thus (9) holds trivially for every $h \in X$. This observation together with Remark 2.1 show that Theorem 2.1 subsumes (when K has nonempty interior) the classical result on the tangent cone in the regular case.

Remark 2.2 If K is a finitely generated cone, then (10) is equivalent to (7), as the right-hand sides of these relations coincide. But in the general case, one cannot substitute the weaker condition (7) into the sufficiency part of the theorem, as illustrated by the following example.

Example 2.1 Let $X = \mathbb{R}$, $Y = \mathbb{R}^3$, and

$$K = \text{cone}\{y \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid y_1 = 1, y_3 = |y_2|^{3/2}\}, \\ F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \quad F(x) = (1, x, x^2).$$

For the point $\bar{x} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}$, for element $h = 1$ condition (8) holds with $\bar{h} = h$. At the same time, 0 is obviously an isolated point of the set D given by (1), and hence $T_D(\bar{x}) = \{0\}$.

3 Optimality conditions

We now turn our attention to the optimization problem (4), where the feasible set is given by (1). We assume that K is a closed convex cone with nonempty interior (for primal-dual optimality conditions, also finitely generated), the objective function f is Fréchet-differentiable at the point $\bar{x} \in D$ under consideration, and the mapping F is twice Fréchet-differentiable at \bar{x} .

Following the developments of section 2, we first introduce some relevant cones. Let $H_2(\bar{x})$ be the set of all

elements satisfying the second-order necessary conditions of tangency stated in Theorem 2.1, i.e.,

$$H_2(\bar{x}) := \{h \in X \mid (7), (9) \text{ hold}\},$$

and $\tilde{H}_2(\bar{x})$ be the set of elements satisfying the two relations (10) and (9), which appear in the sufficiency part:

$$\tilde{H}_2(\bar{x}) := \{h \in X \mid (9), (10) \text{ hold}\}.$$

Finally, let $\bar{H}_2(\bar{x})$ consist of all elements satisfying the sufficient conditions of tangency stated in Theorem 2.1, i.e.,

$$\bar{H}_2(\bar{x}) := \{h \in \tilde{H}_2(\bar{x}) \mid (8) \text{ holds for some } \bar{h} \in X\}.$$

By these definitions,

$$\bar{H}_2(\bar{x}) \cup \{0\} \subset \tilde{H}_2(\bar{x}) \subset H_2(\bar{x}). \quad (11)$$

Note that if the second-order regularity condition holds with respect to all $h \in \tilde{H}_2(\bar{x}) \setminus \{0\}$, then the first inclusion in (11) holds as an equality. If cone K is finitely generated, then the second inclusion is also an equality (recall Remark 2.2). By Theorem 2.1, we also have that

$$\bar{H}_2(\bar{x}) \cup \{0\} \subset T_D(\bar{x}) \subset H_2(\bar{x}). \quad (12)$$

If K is finitely generated and the second-order regularity condition holds with respect to all $h \in \tilde{H}_2(\bar{x}) \setminus \{0\}$, then we have equalities throughout (12).

The left-hand inclusion in (12) immediately implies the following primal necessary optimality condition for our problem.

Theorem 3.1 *Let X and Y be normed linear spaces, and let K be a closed convex cone in Y with a nonempty interior. Assume that $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Fréchet-differentiable, and $F : X \rightarrow Y$ is twice Fréchet-differentiable at a point $\bar{x} \in D$, where D is given by (1). If \bar{x} is a local solution of (4), (1), then*

$$\langle f'(\bar{x}), h \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in \bar{H}_2(\bar{x}). \quad (13)$$

If X is finite-dimensional, the right-hand inclusion in (12) implies that the following condition is sufficient for \bar{x} to be a strict local solution of our problem:

$$\langle f'(\bar{x}), h \rangle > 0 \quad \forall h \in H_2(\bar{x}) \setminus \{0\}. \quad (14)$$

Dualizing (13), we can write that

$$f'(\bar{x}) \in (\bar{H}_2(\bar{x}))^*,$$

which is the primal-dual form of necessary optimality conditions. Explicit evaluation of the dual cone in the right-hand side of the above relation in full generality is an extremely difficult problem. However, we are able to

give some meaningful results under additional assumptions. Specifically, if cone K is finitely generated and for some $h \in \bar{H}_2(\bar{x})$ the inequality in (13) holds as an equality, we derive an explicit primal-dual form of necessary optimality conditions. Note that further study of such “critical direction” h is of particular importance in view of the violation of the sufficient optimality condition (14).

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Let K be a finitely generated cone, and let the point \bar{x} be a local minimizer for problem (4), (1). Assume that*

$$\exists h \in \bar{H}_2(\bar{x}) : \langle f'(\bar{x}), h \rangle = 0. \quad (15)$$

Then there exist two linear functionals $y_1^ = y_1^*(h)$, $y_2^* = y_2^*(h)$ such that*

$$y_1^* \in K^* \cap \{F(\bar{x})\}^\perp \cap \{F'(\bar{x})h\}^\perp, \quad (16)$$

$$y_2^* \in K^* \cap \{F(\bar{x})\}^\perp \cap (\text{Im } F'(\bar{x}))^\perp \cap \{F''(\bar{x})[h]^2\}^\perp, \quad (17)$$

and

$$f'(\bar{x}) = (F'(\bar{x}))^* y_1^* + (F''(\bar{x})[h])^* y_2^*. \quad (18)$$

Theorem 3.2 subsumes classical first-order necessary optimality conditions for the regular case, as in that case necessarily

$$K^* \cap \{F(\bar{x})\}^\perp \cap (\text{Im } F'(\bar{x}))^\perp \cap \{F''(\bar{x})[h]^2\}^\perp = \{0\}. \quad (19)$$

Therefore $y_2^* = 0$, and representation (16)–(18) reduces to

$$f'(\bar{x}) = (F'(\bar{x}))^* y_1^*, \quad (20)$$

with y_1^* satisfying (16). Furthermore, by Remark 2.1, in the regular case Theorem 3.2 can be applied by choosing $h = 0$. With this choice, (16) takes the form

$$y_1^* \in K^* \cap \{F(\bar{x})\}^\perp. \quad (21)$$

Combined with feasibility condition $F(\bar{x}) \in K$, relations (20), (21) coincide with the classical optimality conditions (5), where the nonsingular multiplier $y_0 = 1$ is chosen. In terms of the nonlinear programming problem, the inclusion $y_1^* \in K^*$ is the nonnegativity condition for the Lagrange multipliers, and the inclusion $y_1^* \in \{F(\bar{x})\}^\perp$ is the condition of complementary slackness.

As will be shown in section 4, Theorem 3.2 also contains optimality conditions under the second-order regularity of [3] but can be applicable when the latter is not.

4 Comparisons and an example

In this section, we provide a comparison of the results obtained above with known approaches to irregular problems, and illustrate our development by an example.

First, we mention Abadie’s and Kuhn–Tucker’s constraint qualifications (CQs) for nonlinear programming [10] (there are also some other CQs of similar type). These are weaker than the Mangasarian–Fromovitz constraint qualification (MFCQ) but still guarantee that the tangent cone is given by the linearized model of the constraints. Such CQs of nonalgebraic nature are usually rather difficult to verify directly. Moreover, we deal here with a more general case in which the tangent cone does not necessarily coincide with the linearized cone.

The next issue that deserves to be discussed is reformulating inequality constraints as equalities, with the aim of subsequently using results available for the latter. One might try to apply known optimality conditions for (irregular) equality-constrained problems (the so-called 2-regularity theory, see [7, 1] and references therein) to the corresponding reformulations of irregular inequality constraints. We next show that in our context, applicability of this approach is very limited.

For simplicity, let us take $Y = \mathbb{R}^m$, $K = \mathbb{R}_-^m$, and $F(\bar{x}) = 0$, and reformulate the inequality-constrained set D by introducing slacks:

$$\Delta = \{(x, u) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^m \mid F(x) + u = 0, u \geq 0\}.$$

Clearly, the equality constraint in Δ is regular at every point, but MFCQ is still violated at $(\bar{x}, 0)$. Hence, the classical results for the regular case and irregular equality-constrained case are both not applicable.

Another possibility is a purely equality-constrained reformulation:

$$\Delta = \{(x, u) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^m \mid F(x) + u^2 = 0\},$$

where the square is componentwise. Application of 2-regularity theory leads to something meaningful only when $\ker F'(\bar{x}) \neq \{0\}$, which is an unnatural requirement for inequality constraints. It seems that developing a special approach specifically designed for inequality constraints is really necessary. An initial step in the direction pursued in the present paper was made in [5].

Another known approach to irregular problems consists of second-order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions of Levitin–Milyutin–Osmolovskii type, e.g., [9, 3, 1], which employ F. John first-order necessary conditions. This approach is effective when applied to inequality-constrained problems, but it leads to results of a completely different nature than ours. In particular, this approach is not based on describing the tangent directions.

Next, we discuss the well-known second-order CQ [3], which was introduced using second-order parabolic tangent sets, and which is especially relevant for irregular inequality-constrained problems. In our setting, this

CQ can be stated as follows: there exists $h \in X$ such that

$$\langle f'(\bar{x}), h \rangle = 0, \quad (22)$$

$$F'(\bar{x})h \in K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\}, \quad (23)$$

$$F''(\bar{x})[h]^2 \in \text{int } K + \text{lin}\{F(\bar{x})\} + \text{Im } F'(\bar{x}). \quad (24)$$

This condition is also weaker than Robinson's regularity (in the regular case, (22)–(24) hold with $h = 0$), yet it guarantees that if \bar{x} is a local solution of (4), (1), then F. John-necessary conditions are satisfied with a nonzero multiplier corresponding to the objective function. But observe that in Theorem 2.1 we consider a larger set of directions than those satisfying (23), (24). Namely, for an element h satisfying second-order necessary conditions of tangency, this theorem gives constructive sufficient conditions for h to be a limit point of elements satisfying (23), (24). This is important, because it is certainly possible that (22) does not hold for any h satisfying (23), (24), but that it does hold for some limit point of such elements. Moreover, Example 4.1 below illustrates that this situation (i.e., the second-order CQ (22)–(24) is violated, but our Theorem 3.2 is applicable) is in fact quite likely to occur.

Finally, note that if h is an element satisfying (22)–(24), then (15) also holds, and the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 are satisfied. Moreover, in this case, (19) holds. Hence, relation (17) in Theorem 3.2 implies that $y_2^* = 0$.

To complete this section, we present an example illustrating all the results derived above.

Example 4.1 Let $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$, $K = \mathbb{R}_-^2$, and consider a family of functions

$$f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f(x) = ax_1 + bx_2 + \omega_1(x)$$

and the mapping

$$F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad F(x) = \left(-x_1, -\frac{1}{2}(x_1^2 - x_2^2) \right) + \omega_2(x),$$

where $\omega_1 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $|\omega_1(x)| = o(\|x\|)$, and $\omega_2 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\|\omega_2(x)\| = o(\|x\|^2)$.

Consider the point $\bar{x} = 0$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . It can be easily seen that MFCQ does not hold here, and so classical theory does not apply. By direct computations, using Theorem 2.1 we obtain that

$$T_D(0) = H_2(0) = \{h \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid h_1 \geq |h_2|\},$$

which is actually geometrically obvious. Observe further that the linearized cone is different from $T_D(0)$. Hence, the Kuhn–Tucker, Abadie, and any other CQs of such a kind are violated in this example.

It is easy to see that for all values of parameters a and b , the F. John conditions (5) for problem (4), (1) hold at 0 with $y_0 = 0$. Furthermore, y_0 can be nonzero only if $b = 0$ and $a \leq 0$.

As is easy to see, the set of elements satisfying (23), (24) is $\{h \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid h_1 > |h_2|\}$. Clearly, if 0 is a local minimizer, conditions (22)–(24) can hold for some h simultaneously only if $a = b = 0$.

We next illustrate our approach, considering several characteristic values of the parameters.

If $a = 1$, $b = -1$, then 0 is a (nonisolated) local minimizer for problem (4), (1). As is easy to see,

$$\langle f'(0), h \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in H_2(0), \quad (25)$$

which illustrates Theorem 3.1. Note that for $h = (1, 1) \in H_2(0)$, the latter inequality holds as equality, and our primal-dual optimality conditions (16)–(18) are satisfied with the multipliers

$$y_1^* = (0, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_-, \quad y_2^* = (0, -1) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

This gives an illustration for Theorem 3.2. Note that for $h \in H_2(0) \setminus \text{lin}\{(1, 1)\}$, a similar representation does not hold. The reason is that for such h , strict inequality holds in (25).

If $a = 1$, $b = 0$, then (25) holds as a strict inequality for every $h \in H_2(0) \setminus \{0\}$, and 0 is an isolated local minimizer. This illustrates sufficient optimality condition (14).

Finally, if $a = 0$, $b = 1$, then it is easy to see that (25) does not hold for those elements $h \in H_2(0)$ for which $h_2 < 0$. Theorem 3.1 implies that 0 is not a local minimizer in this case. We could similarly use Theorem 3.2 to verify this conclusion. Indeed, for the element $h = (1, 0) \in H_2(0)$, (25) holds as an equality, but there exist no multipliers $y_1^*, y_2^* \in \mathbb{R}^2$ for which (18) holds.

5 Some further developments

5.1 Second-order optimality conditions

To derive second-order optimality conditions, we need the following notion. Let X and Σ be normed linear spaces, and let a mapping $\Phi : X \rightarrow \Sigma$ be twice Fréchet-differentiable at a point $\bar{x} \in X$. Suppose that $\Sigma_1 = \text{Im } \Phi'(\bar{x})$ is closed and has a closed complementary subspace Σ_2 in Σ . Let P be a projector onto Σ_2 parallel to Σ_1 in Σ . (By assumptions above, this projector is continuous.) In this setting, the mapping Φ is referred to as *2-regular at the point \bar{x} with respect to an element $h \in X$* (see [7, 1]) if

$$\text{Im}(\Phi'(\bar{x}) + P\Phi''(\bar{x})[h]) = \Sigma.$$

Theorem 5.1 *Let X and Y be Banach spaces, let K be a closed finitely generated cone in Y with a nonempty interior, and let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be twice and $F : X \rightarrow Y$ be three times Fréchet-differentiable at the point \bar{x} , which is a local minimizer for problem (4), (1). Assume that (15) holds, and let $\tilde{\Pi}$ be a (continuous) projector onto some closed complementary subspace \tilde{Y} of $\text{lin}\{F(\bar{x}), F'(\bar{x})h\}$ in Y . Assume finally that*

$$\tilde{\Pi}F''(\bar{x})[h]^2 \in \tilde{\Pi} \text{Im } F'(\bar{x})$$

and that the mapping $\Phi : X \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$, $\Phi(x) = \tilde{\Pi}F(x)$, is 2-regular at the point \bar{x} with respect to h . Then for every $y_1^, y_2^* \in Y^*$ satisfying (16)–(18), it holds that*

$$f''(\bar{x})[h]^2 - \langle y_1^*, F''(\bar{x})[h]^2 \rangle - \frac{1}{3} \langle y_2^*, F'''(\bar{x})[h]^3 \rangle \geq 0.$$

The next example illustrates that Theorem 5.1 provides additional information that can be used to eliminate candidates for optimality.

Example 5.1 Consider the setting of Example 4.1, where $a = 1$, $b = -1$, $\omega_2(\cdot) \equiv 0$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , and $\omega_1 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quadratic form negative on $h = (1, 1)$. Then the first-order necessary conditions given by Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 are satisfied at 0 (see Example 4.1), but by direct inspection it can be seen that the second-order necessary optimality conditions given by Theorem 5.1 are violated. We conclude that 0 is not a local minimizer for problem (4), (1).

5.2 Mixed equality and inequality constraints

In contrast to the regular case, it appears very difficult (if not impossible) to extend the results for irregular equality- or inequality-constrained problems to the case with mixed inequality and equality constraints (i.e., to avoid the condition $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$), except for some special cases. One special case, specifically where the singularity/irregularity is due to equality-type constraints only, is studied thoroughly in [2, 8]. Let us consider briefly the opposite case. Let set D now be given by

$$D = \{x \in X \mid F(x) \in K, G(x) = 0\}. \quad (26)$$

Assume $G : X \rightarrow Z$ is three times continuously differentiable, where X and Z are Banach spaces. Suppose G is regular at a point $\bar{x} \in D$, i.e., $\text{Im } G'(\bar{x}) = Z$, and there exists a continuous projector Π on $\text{Ker } G'(\bar{x})$ in Z . According to the classical facts of nonlinear analysis, under those assumptions there exist a neighborhood U of 0 in X and a mapping $\rho : U \rightarrow X$ such that $\rho(0) = \bar{x}$, $\rho(U)$ is a neighborhood of \bar{x} in X , ρ is a C^3 -diffeomorphism from U onto $\rho(U)$, and

$$G(\rho(x)) = G'(\bar{x})x \quad \forall x \in U,$$

and the explicit formulas for the first three derivatives of ρ are available. Now instead of a feasible point \bar{x} of

problem (4), (26), we can consider for local analysis the feasible point 0 of the *inequality-constrained* problem

$$\min \{\varphi(x) \mid x \in \Delta\}, \quad \Delta = \{x \in \tilde{X} \cap U \mid \Phi(x) \in K\},$$

where $\tilde{X} = \text{Ker } G'(\bar{x})$,

$$\varphi(x) = f(\rho(x)), \quad \Phi(x) = F(\rho(x)), \quad x \in U.$$

Applying the analysis developed in this paper to the latter problem, optimality conditions for problem (4), (26) can be derived.

References

- [1] A. V. ARUTYUNOV, *Optimality Conditions: Abnormal and Degenerate Problems*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 2000.
- [2] Y. R. AVAKOV, *Necessary extremum conditions for smooth abnormal problems with equality- and inequality constraints*, J. Math. Notes, 45 (1989), pp. 431–437.
- [3] J. F. BEN-TAL AND J. ZOWE, *A unified theory of first and second order optimality conditions for extremum problems in topological vector spaces*, Math. Programming Study, 19 (1982), pp. 39–76.
- [4] J. F. BONNANS AND A. SHAPIRO, *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [5] A. F. IZMAILOV, *Optimality conditions for degenerate extremum problems with inequality-type constraints*, Comput. Math. Math. Phys., 34 (1994), pp. 723–736.
- [6] A. F. IZMAILOV AND M. V. SOLODOV, *Optimality conditions for irregular inequality-constrained problems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 40 (2001), pp. 1280–1295.
- [7] A. F. IZMAILOV AND A. A. TRETYAKOV, *Factor analysis of Nonlinear Mappings* (in Russian), Nauka, Moscow, Russia, 1994.
- [8] U. LEDZEWICZ AND H. SCHÄTTLER, *High-order approximations and generalized necessary conditions for optimality*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 37 (1998), pp. 33–53.
- [9] E. S. LEVITIN, A. A. MILYUTIN, AND N. P. OSMOLOVSKII, *Conditions of higher order for a local minimum in problems with constraints*, Russian Math. Surveys, 33 (1978), pp. 97–168.
- [10] O. L. MANGASARIAN, *Nonlinear Programming*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1969.