

Accepted Manuscript

The multiobjective steepest descent direction is not Lipschitz continuous,
but is Hölder continuous

Benar F. Svaiter

PII: S0167-6377(18)30081-6
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2018.05.008>
Reference: OPERES 6370

To appear in: *Operations Research Letters*

Received date: 17 February 2018
Revised date: 23 May 2018
Accepted date: 23 May 2018

Please cite this article as: B.F. Svaiter, The multiobjective steepest descent direction is not Lipschitz continuous, but is Hölder continuous, *Operations Research Letters* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2018.05.008>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



The multiobjective steepest descent direction is not Lipschitz continuous, but is Hölder continuous

Benar F. Svaiter* †

May 23, 2018

Abstract

The aim of this manuscript is to characterize the continuity properties of the multiobjective steepest descent direction (vector field) for smooth objective functions. We will show that this vector field is Hölder continuous with optimal exponent $1/2$. In particular, this vector field fails to be Lipschitz continuous even for polynomial objectives.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 90C29, 90C30.

Key words: multiobjective optimization; steepest descent direction; Lipschitz continuity; Hölder continuity

multiobjective optimization; Pareto optimality, steepest descent direction, Lipschitz continuity, Hölder continuity.

1 Introduction

In multiobjective optimization (MO) problems many functions on the same argument have to be simultaneously minimized. Since in general there is no common minimizer for these functions, one shall rely on another notion of optimality. Up to now, in this setting, the most useful definition of optimality is that of Pareto [11]: A point is a Pareto optimal if its image is minimal in the image of the feasible set with respect to the componentwise (partial) order. Vector optimization is a generalization of MO where a closed convex cone is used to define the partial order for which minimal elements are to be computed. If the cone is the positive orthant one retrieves the componentwise order of MO.

Descent methods for multiobjective and vector optimization are, presently, areas of intense research (see [5, 3, 2, 4, 13, 9, 16, 8, 14, 12, 15, 7, 1, 6] and the references therein). These are iterative methods in which *all* objective functions decrease along the generated sequences. As far as we now know, the first one of these methods was proposed by Mukai in [10]. In this work, six descent methods for *constrained* MO were proposed, three of which become, in the unconstrained case, the steepest descent method. In his pioneer work, Mukai neither studied the continuity properties of the MO

*IMPA, Estrada Dona Castorina 110, 22460-320 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (benar@impa.br) tel: 55 (21) 25295112, fax: 55 (21)25124115.

†Partially supported by CNPq grant 306247/2015-1 and by FAPERJ grant Cientistas de Nosso Estado E-26/201.584/2014

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7543777>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/7543777>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)