A note on the reformulation of nonlinear complementarity problems using the Fischer-Burmeister function

Roberto Andreani * José Mario Martínez †

May 13, 1998

Abstract

A bounded-level-set result for a reformulation of the bounded nonlinear complementarity problem proposed recently by Facchinei, Fischer and Kanzow is proved. An application of this result to the (unbounded) nonlinear complementarity problem is suggested.
Keywords. Complementarity, unconstrained minimization, reformulation.

AMS: 90C33, 90C30

*Department of Computer Science and Statistics, University of the State of S. Paulo (UNESP), C.P. 136, CEP 15054-000, São José do Rio Preto-SP, Brazil. This author was supported by FAPESP (Grants 96/1552-0 and 96/12503- 0). E-mail: andreani@nimitz.dcce.ibilce.unesp.br

†Department of Applied Mathematics, IMECC-UNICAMP, University of Campinas, CP 6065, 13081-970 Campinas SP, Brazil. This author was supported by PRONEX, FAPESP (Grant 90-3724-6), CNPq and FAEP-UNICAMP. E-Mail: martinez@ime.unicamp.br

1 Main results

The Bounded Nonlinear Complementarity Problem (BNCP) is the Variational Inequality Problem associated to the compact box

$$\Omega = \{x \in I\!R^n \mid \ell \leq x \leq r\}. \tag{1}$$

Therefore, given $F : I\!R^n \to I\!R^n$, $F \in C^1(I\!R^n)$ the BNCP consists on finding $x \in \Omega$ such that

$$\langle F(z) - F(x), z - x\rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad z \in \Omega. \tag{2}$$

The Nonlinear Complementarity Problem (NCP) is the problem (2) when $\Omega = \{x \in I\!R^n \mid x \geq 0\}$.

Facchinei, Fischer and Kanzow [1] proposed a reformulation of the BNCP as the following optimization problem:

$$\text{Minimize } \|F(x) - u + v\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(u_i, x_i - \ell_i)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(v_i, r_i - x_i)^2, \tag{3}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidian norm and φ is the Fischer-Burmeister function

$$\varphi(a, b) = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2} - a - b \qquad \text{for all} \qquad a, b \in I\!R.$$

From now on we call $f(x, u, v)$ the objective function of (3). It is easy to see that $f(x^*, u^*, v^*) = 0$ if, and only if, x^* is a solution of the BNCP. In [1] it was proved that if (x^*, u^*, v^*) is a stationary point of f and $F'(x^*)$ is a P_0-matrix it necessarily holds that $f(x^*, u^*, v^*) = 0$. The first result of this note will be to prove that, below a critical value, the level sets of f are bounded.

Theorem 1. *Assume that* $-\infty < \ell_i < r_i < \infty$ *for all* $i = 1, \ldots, n$ *and*

$$\alpha < (r_i - \ell_i)/\sqrt{2} \qquad \textit{for all} \qquad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Then the set $S \equiv \{(x, u, v) \in I\!R^{3n} \mid f(x, u, v) \leq \alpha^2\}$ *is bounded.*

Proof. Let (x, u, v) be such that $f(x, u, v) \leq \alpha^2$. Suppose that $x_i - \ell_i < -\alpha$. Then

$$\alpha \leq \sqrt{u_i^2 + \alpha^2} + \alpha - u_i < \sqrt{u_i^2 + (x_i - \ell_i)^2} - (x_i - \ell_i) - u_i$$

$$= \varphi(u_i, x_i - \ell_i).$$

This implies that $f(x,u,v) > \alpha^2$. Therefore, if $(x,u,v) \in S$ we necessarily have that

$$x_i \geq \ell_i - \alpha \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{4}$$

The same reasoning allows us to prove that

$$u_i \geq -\alpha, \tag{5}$$

$$x_i \leq r_i - \alpha, \tag{6}$$

and

$$v_i \geq -\alpha \tag{7}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Suppose now that S is unbounded. Therefore S contains an unbounded sequence (x^k, u^k, v^k). By (4-7) this implies that there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $u_i^k \to \infty$ or there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $v_i^k \to \infty$. Consider the first case. We have that

$$\alpha^2 \geq f(x,u,v) \geq ([F(x^k)]_i - u_i^k + v_i^k)^2.$$

So,

$$\alpha \geq |[F(x^k)]_i - u_i^k + v_i^k| \geq |u_i^k| - |v_i^k| - |[F(x^k)]_i|.$$

Since $|[F(x^k)]_i|$ is bounded, this implies that $v_i^k \to \infty$. Analogously, if we assume $v_i^k \to \infty$ we necessarily obtain that $u_i^k \to \infty$ too. So, we can assume that there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that both $u_i^k \to \infty$ and $v_i^k \to \infty$. Taking an appropriate subsequence, assume, without loss of generality, that $\{x_i^k\}$ is convergent, say, $x_i^k \to x_i^*$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sqrt{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2} - u_i^k$$

$$= \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{[\sqrt{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2} - u_i^k][\sqrt{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2} + u_i^k]}{[\sqrt{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2} + u_i^k]}$$

$$= \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2 - (u_i^k)^2}{[\sqrt{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2} + u_i^k]} = 0.$$

So,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sqrt{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2} - (x_i^k - \ell_i) - u_i^k = \ell_i - x_i^*. \tag{8}$$

Analogously,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sqrt{(v_i^k)^2 + (r_i - x_i^k)^2} - (r_i - x_i^k) - v_i^k = x_i^* - r_i. \tag{9}$$

But

$$\alpha^2 \geq f(x^k, u^k, v^k)$$
$$\geq \varphi(u_i^k, x_i^k - \ell_i)^2 + \varphi(v_i^k, r_i - x_i^k)^2$$
$$= [\sqrt{(u_i^k)^2 + (x_i^k - \ell_i)^2} - (x_i^k - \ell_i) - u_i^k]^2 + [\sqrt{(v_i^k)^2 + (r_i - x_i^k)^2} - (r_i - x_i^k) - v_i^k]^2.$$

Therefore, by (8-9),

$$\alpha^2 \geq (x_i^* - \ell_i)^2 + (x_i^* - r_i)^2. \tag{10}$$

But the minimum value of the right hand side of (10) is $(r_i - \ell_i)^2/2$. So, by the definition of α, we arrived to a contradiction. □

Counterexample

In this counterexample, we show that the previous result is sharp. That is to say, the level set defined by $f(x, u, v) \leq \beta^2$ can be unbounded, where

$$\beta = \min \{(r_i - \ell_i)/\sqrt{2}, i = 1, \ldots, n\}.$$

Define $F(x) = \varepsilon x$ $(\varepsilon \geq 0)$ and $\Omega = \{x \in I\!R \mid 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$. So,

$$f(x, u, v) = (\varepsilon x - u + v)^2 + \varphi(u, x)^2 + \varphi(v, 1 - x)^2.$$

The sequence $\{y^k \equiv (1/2, k, k), k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is unbounded. However,

$$f(y^k) = (\varepsilon/2 - k + k)^2 + 2\varphi(k, 1/2)^2$$
$$= \varepsilon^2/4 + 2(\sqrt{1/4 + k^2} - 1/2 - k)^2 \leq \varepsilon^2/4 + 1/2 = \varepsilon^2/4 + \beta^2.$$

2 Application to the NCP

The Fischer-Burmeister function has been applied by many authors to the nonlinear complementarity problem NCP by means of the reformulation

$$\text{Minimize} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varphi(x_i, [F(x)]_i)^2. \tag{11}$$

See the references of [1]. If x^* is a stationary point of (11) and $F'(x^*)$ is a P_0-matrix, it can be ensured that x^* is a solution of the NCP. If F is a uniform $P-$function it can also be proved that the objective function of (11) has bounded level sets, but this property could not hold under weaker assumptions.

In fact, consider the NCP defined by $F(x) = 1 - e^{-x}$. This function is strictly monotone and 0 is a solution. However the level sets of the function (11) are not bounded. In fact, for all $x > 0$,

$$\varphi(x, F(x))^2 = \left(\sqrt{x^2 + (1-e^{-x})^2} - (x + 1 - e^{-x})\right)^2 =$$

$$\left(\frac{-2x(1-e^{-x})}{\sqrt{x^2 + (1-e^{-x})^2} + (x + 1 - e^{-x})}\right)^2 =$$

$$\frac{4(1-e^{-x})^2}{\left(\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{1-e^{-x}}{x}\right)^2} + (1 + \frac{1-e^{-x}}{x})\right)^2} \leq 1.$$

So, it is natural to ask whether the bounded-level-set result proved in the previous section can help to establish bounded-level-set reformulations of the NCP using the Fischer- Burmeister function.

Let us define $\underline{L} = (L, \ldots, L) \in I\!R^n$ and consider the box

$$\Omega_L = \{x \in I\!R^n \ \mid \ 0 \leq x \leq \underline{L}\}.$$

Obviously, the NCP is naturally connected with the BNCP defined by F and Ω_L. In the Facchinei-Fischer-Kanzow reformulation, the corresponding objective function is

$$f(x, u, v) = \|F(x) - u + v\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(u_i, x_i)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(v_i, L - x_i)^2. \qquad (12)$$

Clearly,

$$f(0, 0, 0) = \|F(0)\|^2.$$

Therefore, if we take $L > \|F(0)\|^2/2$, Theorem 1 guarantees that

$$\{x \in I\!R^n \ \mid \ f(x, u, v) \leq f(0, 0, 0)\} \quad \text{is bounded .}$$

This implies that standard unconstrained minimization algorithms, which usually generate sequences satisfying $f(x^{k+1}, u^{k+1}, v^{k+1}) \leq f(x^k, u^k, v^k)$ for all k will generate bounded sequences, if $(x^0, u^0, v^0) = (0, 0, 0)$. As a consequence, algorithms of that class will find stationary points, which, under the assumptions of [1], will be solutions of the BNCP defined by F and Ω_L. So, in order to solve the NCP we only need to guarantee that solutions of this BNCP are solutions of the NCP. An answer to this question is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Assume that there exists a solution of the NCP that belongs to Ω_L and that, for all $x, y \in I\!\!R^n$,*

$$([F(x)]_i - [F(y)]_i)(x_i - y_i) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

implies that

$$([F(x)]_i - [F(y)]_i)(x_i - y_i) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then, every stationary point of f (defined by (12)) is a solution of the NCP.

Proof. Let x^* be a stationary point of f. The condition imposed to F in the hypothesis implies that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{(F_i(x) - F_i(y))(x_i - y_i)\} \geq 0.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 5.8 of [2], F is a is P_0-function and $F'(x)$ is a P_0-matrix for all $x \in I\!\!R^n$.

In particular, $F'(x^*)$ is a P_0-matrix. So, by [1], x^* is a solution of the BNCP defined by Ω_L. That is:

$$[F(x^*)]_i \geq 0 \ \text{ if } \ x_i^* = 0, \tag{13}$$

$$[F(x^*)]_i = 0 \ \text{ if } \ 0 < x_i^* < L \tag{14}$$

and

$$[F(x^*)]_i \leq 0 \ \text{ if } \ x_i^* = L. \tag{15}$$

Assume that $\bar{x}$ is a solution of the NCP. This implies that

$$[F(\bar{x})]_i \geq 0 \ \text{ if } \ \bar{x}_i = 0 \text{ and } [F(\bar{x})]_i = 0 \ \text{ if } \ \bar{x}_i > 0. \tag{16}$$

By (13)–(15) and (16) we have that

$$([F(x^*)]_i - [F(\bar{x})]_i)(x_i^* - \bar{x}_i) \leq 0 \tag{17}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Let us define

$$\mathcal{I} = \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid [F(x^*)]_i < 0, x_i^* = L\}. \tag{18}$$

Assume, by contradiction, that $\mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ tal que $[F(x^*)]_j < 0$ and $x_j^* = L$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > [F(x^*)]_j x_j^* &\geq [F(x^*)]_j x_j^* - [F(x^*)]_j \bar{x}_j - [F(\bar{x})]_j x_j^* + [F(\bar{x})]_j \bar{x}_j \\ &= ([F(x^*)]_j - [F(\bar{x})]_j)(x_j^* - \bar{x}_j). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

But (17) and (19) contradict the hypothesis of the theorem.

Therefore, $\mathcal{I} = \emptyset$. Since x^* is a solution of the BNCP, this implies that x^* is a solution of the NCP, as we wanted to prove. □

Remarks. In the linear case ($F(x) = Mx + q$) the hypothesis of Theorem 2 means that the matrix M is column-sufficient. If F is monotone ($\langle F(x) - F(y), x - y \rangle \geq 0$ for all $x, y \in I\!R^n$) or, even, if F is a P-function ($\max_{1 \leq i \leq n}\{(F_i(x) - F_i(y))(x_i - y_i)\} > 0$) this hypothesis holds, but the reciprocal is not true. For example, the matrix

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -3 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is column-sufficient, but not positive semidefinite, therefore F is not monotone. Moreover, M is not a P-matrix either, so F is not a P-function.

Finally, let us show that the hypothesis of this theorem is sharp and cannot be relaxed to, say, P_0-function. In fact, consider the following matrix

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

This is a P_0-matrix, but $F(x) \equiv Mx + q$ does not verify the hypothesis of Theorem 2, since M is not column-sufficient. Obviously, $(0, 0)$ is a solution of the NCP. However, taking $L = 2$, we have that all the points of the form $(t, 2)$ for $t \in [\frac{2}{3}, 2]$, are solutions of the BNCP defined by $F(x) = Mx + q$, $\ell = 0, r = \underline{L}$. So, these points are stationary points of the associated optimization problem but, clearly, they are not solutions of the NCP.

3 Conclusions

When, for some nonlinear programming reformulation of a complementarity or variational inequality problem, it is known that every stationary point is a solution, it can be conjectured that standard minimization algorithms will be effective for finding a solution, since these algorithms generally find, in the limit, stationary points. However, at least from the theoretical point of view, the effectiveness of the minimization approach is not proved unless, eventually, a bounded level set can be reached. Otherwise there could be no convergent subsequence at all. In this paper we proved that a reformulation of nonlinear complementarity problems satisfies the desired requirements under weaker conditions than the ones established before.

References

[1] F. Facchinei, A. Fischer and C. Kanzow [1997], A semismooth Newton method for variational inequalities: the case of box constraints, in *Complementarity and variational problems: state of art*, edited by M. C. Ferris and J-S Pang, SIAM, Philadelphia, pp. 76–90.

[2] J. J. Moré and W. C. Rheinboldt [1973], On P- and S-functions and related classes of n-dimensional nonlinear mappings, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 6, pp. 45-68.