

# Global Error for Generalized Complementarity Problems based on Generalized Fisher-Burmeister Function

Mohamed A. Tawhid<sup>1,2,\*</sup> and Wei-Zhe Gu<sup>3,4,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Faculty of Science, Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, BC, V2C 0C8, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Faculty of Science, Alexandria University, Moharam Bey 21511, Alexandria, Egypt

<sup>3</sup> Department of Mathematics, School of Science, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, P.R. China

<sup>4</sup> Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Faculty of Science, Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, BC, V2C 0C8, Canada

Received: 16 Jun. 2015, Revised: 14 Aug. 2015, Accepted: 15 Aug. 2015

Published online: 1 Jan. 2016

---

**Abstract:** In this paper, we provide global error bounds generalized complementarity problem, denoted by  $GCP(f, g)$  based on the generalized Fisher-Burmeister function and its generalizations under certain conditions. These error bounds can be viewed not only as extensions of previously known results the existing but also new results for the nonlinear/generalized complementarity problems.

**Keywords:** Error bounds, generalized complementarity problem, GCP function, generalized FB function, natural residual.

---

## 1 Introduction

It is well known that error bounds can be used to measure how much the approximate solution fails to be in the solution set and to analyze the convergence rates of various methods. The study of the error bounds has received increasing attention in the last decades, see the survey paper by Pang [23] and references therein. The error bounds have played important roles in stopping rules and the convergence analysis for many iterative algorithms, and in the treatment of various issues in the areas of complementarity problems and variational inequalities. Further, it can be used in the sensitivity analysis of the problems when their data is subject to perturbation [6], [9], [23].

The global error bound, that is, an upper bound estimation of the distance from a given point in  $R^n$  to the solution set of the problem in terms of some residual functions, is an important one [23]. The error bound estimation for the classical linear complementarity problems (LCP) [17], [18], [20], [30], nonlinear complementarity problems [19] and the generalized linear complementarity problems over a polyhedral cone [26] were analyzed. In the special cases of linear/nonlinear complementarity problems, the natural residual has played an important role in establishing global error

bounds, see, e.g., [17], [19], [20]. It plays a similar role in our analysis for generalized nonlinear complementarity problems [16]. In this paper, we study the global error for generalized nonlinear complementarity problems based on the generalized Fisher-Burmeister function and its generalizations under certain conditions.

### 1.1 The Problem

Consider the generalized complementarity problem corresponding to  $f$  and  $g$ , denoted by  $GCP(f, g)$ , which is to find a vector  $x^* \in \mathfrak{R}^n$  such that

$$f(x^*) \geq 0, \quad g(x^*) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f(x^*), g(x^*) \rangle = 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $f : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^n$  and  $g : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^n$  are given  $C^1$  functions.

For the numerical methods formulation, and applications of  $GCP(f, g)$ , we refer the interested readers to [14], [15], [22] and the references cited therein. Also  $GCP(f, g)$  is a generalization of the nonlinear complementarity problem  $NCP(f)$  when  $g(x) = x$ , linear complementarity problem  $LCP(M, q)$  when  $f(x) = Mx + q$  and  $g(x) = x$  with  $M \in R^{n \times n}$  and a vector  $q \in R^n$ , and quasi/implicit complementarity problem when  $g(x) = x - W(x)$  with some  $W : R^n \rightarrow R^n$ , see, e.g., [15], [21], [24].

---

\* Corresponding author e-mail: [Mtawhid@tru.ca](mailto:Mtawhid@tru.ca) [guweizhe@tju.edu.cn](mailto:guweizhe@tju.edu.cn)

The importance of these problems in operations research, optimization, engineering sciences, economics and other areas has been well documented in the literature, see e.g., [4], [5], [7], [8], [13], [25], and the references therein.

One of the popular methods for solving  $GCP(f, g)$  is to reformulate it as a minimization problem, see, e.g., [11], [16], [28]. A function which can constitute an equivalent minimization problem for the  $GCP(f, g)$  is called a merit function. More specifically, a merit function is a function whose global minima on a set  $X \in R^n$  are coincident with the solutions of the original  $GCP(f, g)$ . In order to construct this merit function, we need to define GCP functions. A function  $\phi : R^2 \rightarrow R$  is called a GCP function if

$$\phi(a, b) = 0 \Leftrightarrow ab = 0, a \geq 0, b \geq 0.$$

We call

$$\Phi(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \phi(f_1(x), g_1(x)) \\ \vdots \\ \phi(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ \vdots \\ \phi(f_n(x), g_n(x)) \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

a GCP function for  $GCP(f, g)$ .

We consider a GCP function  $\Phi : R^n \rightarrow R^n$  associated with  $GCP(f, g)$  and its merit function

$$\Psi_*(\bar{x}) := \frac{1}{2} \|\Phi_*(\bar{x})\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_*(f_i(\bar{x}), g_i(\bar{x})), \quad (3)$$

where  $\Phi_*(\bar{x})$  is defined in (2) and

$$\psi_*(a, b) := \frac{1}{2} \phi_*(a, b)^2, \quad (4)$$

with  $*$   $\in \{ \{1, p\}, 1, 2, 3, 4, \{\theta, p\} \}$ .

And for  $\Psi_{\alpha, \theta, p}$ , we denote the corresponding merit function as

$$\Psi_{\alpha, \theta, p}(\bar{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{\alpha, \theta, p}(f_i(\bar{x}), g_i(\bar{x})). \quad (5)$$

So that

$$\Psi_*(\bar{x}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \Phi_*(\bar{x}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \bar{x} \text{ solves } GCP(f, g).$$

If we assume  $GCP(f, g)$  has at least one solution, then a vector  $\bar{x} \in R^n$  solves  $GCP(f, g)$  if and only if it is a global/local minimizer (a stationary point) of the unconstrained minimization problem

$$\min_{x \in R^n} \Psi(x).$$

## 1.2 Example of GCP functions

We give some examples for GCP functions based on the generalized Fisher-Burmeister function and its generalization [2, 1, 12]. Suppose that  $f$  and  $g$  are  $C^1$ .

**Example 1** Consider the following GCP function which is the basis of

$$\phi_p(a, b) := a + b - \|(a, b)\|_p \quad (6)$$

where  $p$  is any fixed real number in the interval  $(1, +\infty)$  and  $\|(a, b)\|_p$  denotes the  $p$ -norm of  $(a, b)$ , i.e.,  $\|(a, b)\|_p = \sqrt[p]{|a|^p + |b|^p}$ . The function  $\phi_p$  was noted by Tseng [29]. For further study on this family of NCP functions, see [2].

The  $i$ th component of GCP function  $\Phi(x)$  in (2) is defined as

$$\Phi_i(x) = \phi_p(f_i(x), g_i(x)) := f_i(x) + g_i(x) - \|(f_i(x), g_i(x))\|_p$$

**Example 2** Consider the following GCP function which is based on proposed family of NCP functions [2] relying on  $\phi_p$  in (6) and some introduced NCP functions in [1]:

$$\phi_1(a, b) := \phi_p(a, b) + \alpha a_+ b_+, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (7)$$

The  $i$ th component of GCP function  $\Phi(x)$  in (2) is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i(x) &= \phi_1(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &:= \phi_p(f_i(x), g_i(x)) + \alpha f_i(x)_+ g_i(x)_+, \quad \alpha > 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Example 3** The following GCP function is based on NCP function in [2]

$$\phi_2(a, b) := \phi_p(a, b) + \alpha (ab)_+, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (8)$$

We define the  $i$ th component of GCP function  $\Phi(x)$  in (2) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i(x) &= \phi_2(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &:= \phi_p(f_i(x), g_i(x)) + \alpha (f_i(x) g_i(x))_+, \quad \alpha > 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Example 4** The following GCP function is based on NCP function in [2]

$$\phi_3(a, b) := \sqrt{[\phi_p(a, b)]^2 + \alpha (a_+ b_+)^2}, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (9)$$

We define the  $i$ th component of GCP function  $\Phi(x)$  in (2) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i(x) &= \phi_3(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &:= \sqrt{[\phi_p(f_i(x), g_i(x))]^2 + \alpha (f_i(x)_+ g_i(x)_+)^2}, \quad \alpha > 0 \end{aligned}$$

**Example 5** Consider following GCP function

$$\phi_4(a, b) := \sqrt{[\phi_p(a, b)]^2 + \alpha [(ab)_+]^2}, \quad \alpha > 0. \quad (10)$$

This function is motivated from NCP function in [2]. Define the  $i$ th component of GCP function  $\Phi(x)$  in (2) as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_i(x) &= \phi_4(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &:= \sqrt{[\phi_p(f_i(x), g_i(x))]^2 + \alpha [(f_i(x) g_i(x))_+]^2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha > 0$ .

**Example 6** We consider the following GCP function which is based on another family of NCP functions [12]

$$\phi_{\theta,p}(a,b) := a + b - \sqrt[p]{\theta(|a|^p + |b|^p) + (1-\theta)|a-b|^p} \quad (11)$$

where  $\theta \in (0,1]$ . It is clear that (11) reduce to (6) when  $\theta = 1$ . In the following, we will denote

$$\phi_{1,p}(a,b) = \phi_p(a,b) = a + b - \|(a,b)\|_p.$$

We define the  $i$ th component of GCP function  $\Phi(x)$  in (2) as

$$\Phi_i(x) = \phi_{\theta,p}(f_i(x), g_i(x)) := \frac{f_i(x) + g_i(x) - \sqrt[p]{\theta(|f_i(x)|^p + |g_i(x)|^p) + (1-\theta)|f_i(x) - g_i(x)|^p}}{2}$$

where  $\theta \in (0,1]$ .

**Example 7** Based on (11) and NCP function in [2], we consider the following GCP function

$$\phi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(a,b) := \frac{\alpha}{2}[(ab)_+]^2 + \frac{1}{2}[\phi_{\theta,p}(a,b)]^2, \quad \alpha \geq 0 \quad (12)$$

where  $\phi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(a,b) : R^2 \rightarrow R_+$ . The  $i$ th component of GCP function  $\Phi(x)$  in (2) is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &:= \frac{\alpha}{2}[(f_i(x)g_i(x))_+]^2 + \frac{1}{2}[\phi_{\theta,p}(f_i(x), g_i(x))]^2, \quad \alpha \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In this article, we give global error bounds generalized complementarity problem, denoted by  $GCP(f,g)$  based on the generalized Fisher-Burmeister function and its generalizations under Relatively uniform (P)- conditions. These error bounds can be viewed as extensions of previously known results in [17], [20], [19] [16].

A word about our notation. Vector inequalities are interpreted componentwise. Vectors in  $R^n$  are regarded as column vectors. The inner-product between two vectors  $x$  and  $y$  in  $R^n$  is denoted by either  $x^T y$  or  $\langle x, y \rangle$ . For a matrix  $A$ , the  $i$ th row of  $A$  is denoted by  $A_i$ . For a differentiable function  $f : R^n \rightarrow R^m$ , the Jacobian matrix of  $f$  at  $\bar{x}$  is denoted by  $\nabla f(\bar{x})$ . The  $p$ -norm of  $x$  is denoted  $\|x\|_p$  and the Euclidean norm of  $x$  is denoted by  $\|x\|$ . Assume that  $p$  is a fixed real number in  $(1, \infty)$ . Also, we use the natural residual merit function  $\Psi_{NR} : R^n \rightarrow R_+$  defined by

$$\Psi_{NR}(x) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_{NR}^2(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \quad \text{where } \phi_{NR} : R^2 \rightarrow R$$

denotes the minimum GCP-function  $\min\{a, b\}$ .

In [27], the author generalized the concepts of monotonicity,  $\mathbf{P}_0$ -property and their variants for functions and use them to establish some conditions to get a solution for generalized complementarity problem when the underlying functions  $f$  and  $g$  are  $H$ -differentiable. .

Let us recall the following definitions from [27].

**Definition 1** For functions  $f, g : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^n$ , we say that  $f$  and  $g$  are:

(a) Relatively monotone if

$$\langle f(x) - f(y), g(x) - g(y) \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathfrak{R}^n.$$

(b) Relatively strictly monotone if

$$\langle f(x) - f(y), g(x) - g(y) \rangle > 0 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathfrak{R}^n.$$

(c) Relatively strongly monotone if there exists a constant  $\mu > 0$  such that

$$\langle f(x) - f(y), g(x) - g(y) \rangle \geq \mu \|x - y\|^2 \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathfrak{R}^n.$$

(d) Relatively  $\mathbf{P}_0(\mathbf{P})$ -functions if for any  $x \neq y$  in  $\mathfrak{R}^n$ ,

$$\max_{i: x_i \neq y_i} [f(x) - f(y)]_i [g(x) - g(y)]_i \geq (>) 0.$$

(e) Relatively uniform (P)-functions if there exists a constant  $\eta > 0$  such that for any  $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ ,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} [f(x) - f(y)]_i [g(x) - g(y)]_i \geq \eta \|x - y\|^2.$$

Note that relatively strongly monotone functions are relatively strictly monotone, and relatively strictly monotone functions are relatively monotone.

## 2 The main result

We start by defining the concepts of a residual, lower and upper error bounds.

**Definition 2** Let  $e : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}, X \in \subseteq \mathfrak{R}^n$  and let

$$dist(x, X) := \inf_{y \in X} \|x - y\|$$

denote the distance of an arbitrary vector  $x$  to the set  $X$ . Assume that  $GCP(f, g)$  has a nonempty solution set  $X^*$ . Then:

(a) the function  $e$  is called a residual of  $GCP(f, g)$  if  $e(x) \geq 0$ , for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ , and  $e(x) = 0$  if and only if  $x$  solves  $GCP(f, g)$ ;

(b) a residual  $e$  is lower global error bound for  $GCP(f, g)$  if there exists some constant  $\tau_1 > 0$  such that  $\tau_1 e(x) \leq dist(x, X^*)$ , for each  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ ; a residual  $e$  is lower local error bound for  $GCP(f, g)$  if there exists some constant  $\bar{\tau}_1 > 0$  such that  $\bar{\tau}_1 e(x) \leq dist(x, X^*)$ , for each  $x \in B$ , where  $B \subset \mathfrak{R}^n$ ;

(c) a residual  $e$  is upper global error bound for  $GCP(f, g)$  if there exists some constant  $\tau_2 > 0$  such that  $dist(x, X^*) \leq \tau_2 e(x)$ , for each  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ ; a residual  $e$  is upper local error bound for  $GCP(f, g)$  if there exists some constant  $\bar{\tau}_2 > 0$  such that  $dist(x, X^*) \leq \bar{\tau}_2 e(x)$ , for each  $x \in B$ , where  $B \subset \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

For each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , define

$$r_i(x) := \min\{f_i(x), g_i(x)\}.$$

Let  $r(x)$  denote the vector with components  $r_i(x)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .  $\|r(x)\|$  is called the natural residual for GCP.

First, we show that the Lipschitz continuity is all what we need for  $r(x)$  to be a lower error bound for  $dist(x, X)$  for any GCP.

**Lemma 1**[16, Lemma 7.2] Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ . Then for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$|r_i(x)| \leq L\|x - x^*\|, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$$

where  $x^*$  is an arbitrary solution of  $GCP(f, g)$ .

**Lemma 2**[16, Lemma 7.4] Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ . Then for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and any solution  $x^* \in \mathfrak{R}^n$  of  $GCP(f, g)$ , we have

$$(f_i(x) - f_i(x^*))(g_i(x) - g_i(x^*)) \leq 2L|r_i(x)|\|x - x^*\|,$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

The proof of the following lemma is similar to Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.1 in [3] so we omit the proof.

**Lemma 3** Let  $\phi_p : \mathfrak{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be defined as (6). Then for any  $p > 1$ , we have

(i)

$$(2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| \leq |\phi_p(a, b)| \leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}|.$$

(ii)

$$[2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}}]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x) \leq \Psi_p(x) \leq [2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}}]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x)$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

**Lemma 4** Let  $\phi_1 : \mathfrak{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be defined as (7). Then for any  $p > 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , we have

(i)

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq |\phi_1(a, b)| \\ &\leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)|\min\{a, b\}| \end{aligned}$$

for any  $a, b \in B_1$ , where  $B_1$  is a set such that  $\max_{x \in B_1} |x| \leq C_1$ .

(ii)

$$[2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}}]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x) \leq \Psi_1(x) \leq [2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x)$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

**Proof.** It is enough to show part (i). When  $a > 0, b > 0$ , then  $\phi_p(a, b) > 0$  and  $a_+ b_+ > 0$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq |\phi_1(a, b)| = \phi_1(a, b) \\ &= \phi_p(a, b) + \alpha a_+ b_+ \leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)|\min\{a, b\}|; \end{aligned}$$

otherwise,  $(2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| \leq |\phi_1(a, b)| = |\phi_p(a, b)| \leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}|$ .

**Lemma 5** Let  $\phi_2 : \mathfrak{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be defined as (8). Then for any  $p > 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , we have

(i)

$$|\phi_2(a, b)| \leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)|\min\{a, b\}|$$

for any  $a, b \in B_1$ , where  $B_1$  is a set such that  $\max_{x \in B_1} |x| \leq C_1$ .

(ii)

$$\Psi_2(x) \leq [2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x)$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

**Proof.** Let us show part (i). If  $a > 0, b > 0$ , then  $\phi_p(a, b) > 0$  and  $(ab)_+ > 0$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_2(a, b)| &= \phi_1(a, b) = \phi_p(a, b) + \alpha(ab)_+ \\ &\leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)|\min\{a, b\}|; \end{aligned}$$

If  $a < 0, b < 0$ , then  $\phi_p(a, b) < 0$  and  $(ab)_+ > 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_2(a, b)| &\leq |\phi_p(a, b)| + \alpha(ab)_+ \\ &\leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)|\min\{a, b\}| \end{aligned}$$

in the other case,

$$|\phi_2(a, b)| = |\phi_p(a, b)| \leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}|.$$

Above all, we have that the conclusion of this Lemma holds.

**Remark 1** For  $\phi_2$ , there does not exist a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $|\phi_2(a, b)| \geq C|\min\{a, b\}|$ . Now we give an example. let  $a = -1, b = -1$ , and  $\alpha = 2 + \sqrt{2}$ , then we have  $|\phi_2(a, b)| = 0$ .

**Lemma 6** Let  $\phi_3 : \mathfrak{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be defined as (9). Then for any  $p > 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , we have

(i)

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq \phi_3(a, b) \\ &\leq \sqrt{(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2} |\min\{a, b\}| \end{aligned}$$

for any  $a, b \in B_1$ , where  $B_1$  is a set such that  $\max_{x \in B_1} |x| \leq C_1$ .

(ii)

$$\begin{aligned} [2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}}]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x) &\leq \Psi_3(x) \\ &\leq [(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2] \Psi_{NR}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathfrak{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** We will prove part (i). When  $a > 0, b > 0$ , then  $\phi_p(a, b) > 0$  and  $(ab)_+ > 0$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq \phi_p(a, b) \leq \phi_3(a, b) \\ &= \sqrt{\phi_p(a, b)^2 + \alpha(a_+ b_+)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\phi_p(a, b)^2 + \alpha \max\{|a|, |b|\}^2} |\min\{a, b\}|^2 \\ &\leq \sqrt{(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2} |\min\{a, b\}|; \end{aligned}$$

otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq |\phi_3(a, b)| = |\phi_p(a, b)| \\ &\leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}|. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 7** Let  $\phi_4 : \mathfrak{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be defined as (10). Then for any  $p > 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , we have

$$(i) \quad \begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq |\phi_4(a, b)| \\ &\leq \sqrt{(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2} |\min\{a, b\}| \end{aligned}$$

for any  $a, b \in B_1$ , where  $B_1$  is a set such that  $\max_{x \in B_1} |x| \leq C_1$ .

$$(ii) \quad [2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}}]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x) \leq \Psi_4(x) \leq [(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2] \Psi_{NR}(x)$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

**Proof.** We will show part (i). When  $a > 0, b > 0$  or  $a < 0, b < 0$ , then  $(ab)_+ > 0$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq |\phi_p(a, b)| \\ &\leq \phi_4(a, b) \\ &= \sqrt{\phi_p(a, b)^2 + \alpha(ab)_+^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\phi_p(a, b)^2 + \alpha \max\{|a|, |b|\}^2 |\min\{a, b\}|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2} |\min\{a, b\}|; \end{aligned}$$

otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}| &\leq |\phi_4(a, b)| = |\phi_p(a, b)| \\ &\leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})|\min\{a, b\}|. \end{aligned}$$

In the following theorems, the merit functions of the GCP functions based on generalized Fisher-Burmeister function and its generalizations provide global error bounds for GCP( $f, g$ ) under appropriate conditions.

Recall that when the solution set is nonempty and  $f$  and  $g$  are relatively uniform (P)-functions, the solution of GCP( $F, G$ ) is unique [16].

**Theorem 1** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1$ , we have

$$\Psi_p(x) \leq \frac{(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} nL^2 \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2,$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

**Proof.** By Lemma 1, we have

$$|r_i(x)| \leq L \text{dist}(x, X^*), \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Combining the inequality with Lemma 3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_p(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n |\phi_p(f_i(x), g_i(x))|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 r_i^2(x) \\ &\leq \frac{(2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} nL^2 \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.

**Theorem 2** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ , and that  $f$  and  $g$  are relatively uniform (P)-functions with constant  $\eta > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1$ , we have

$$\Psi_p(x) \geq \frac{(2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 \eta^2}{8L^2} \|x - x^*\|^2,$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$  and all  $x^* \in X^*$ .

**Proof.** From Lemma 2 and the property of  $f$  and  $g$  being relatively uniform (P)-functions, there exists at least one index  $i_0$  such that

$$|r_{i_0}(x)| \geq \frac{\eta}{2L} \|x - x^*\|,$$

which together with Lemma 3 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_p(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_p^2(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \phi_p^2(f_{i_0}(x), g_{i_0}(x)) \\ &\geq \frac{(2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} |r_{i_0}(x)|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{(2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 \eta^2}{8L^2} \|x - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We get the results.

**Theorem 3** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\Psi_1(x) \leq C \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2, \quad \text{for all } x \in B,$$

where  $B$  is a bounded set.

**Proof.** Since  $f$  and  $g$  are continuous and  $B$  is bounded, then  $\exists C_1 > 0$  such that

$$|\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{|f_i(x)|, |g_i(x)|\}| \leq C_1, \quad \text{for all } x \in B. \quad (13)$$

From the definition of  $\phi_1$  in (7) and Lemma 3, for any  $a, b \in \mathfrak{R}$  and  $\max\{|a|, |b|\} \leq C_1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\phi_1(a, b)| \\ &\leq |\phi_p(a, b)| + \alpha a_+ b_+ \\ &\leq (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1) |\min\{a, b\}| \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the first inequality and the last inequality are from

$$0 \leq a_+ b_+ \leq |ab| \leq \max\{|a|, |b|\} |\min\{a, b\}| \leq C_1 |\min\{a, b\}|.$$

Combining the inequality in Lemma 1, it is followed that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_1(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n |\phi_1(f_i(x), g_i(x))|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n r_i^2(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)^2 nL^2 \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

for any  $x \in B$ . Denote  $C := \frac{1}{2} (2 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} + \alpha C_1)^2 nL^2$ , then  $C > 0$  and  $\Psi_1(x) \leq C \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2$  for any  $x \in B$ .

**Theorem 4** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , there exist constants  $C_i > 0, i = 2, 3, 4$  such that

$$\Psi_i(x) \leq C_i \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2, \quad i = 2, 3, 4, \text{ for all } x \in B,$$

where  $B$  is a bounded set.

**Proof.** By a similar proof as in Theorem 3, we can get the results.

**Theorem 5** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ , and that  $f$  and  $g$  are relatively uniform **(P)**-functions with constant  $\eta > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1, \alpha > 0$ , there exist constants  $\bar{C}_i > 0, i = 1, 3, 4$  such that

$$\Psi_i(x) \geq \bar{C}_i \|x - x^*\|^2, \quad \text{for all } x \in B \text{ and all } x^* \in X^*.$$

where  $B$  is a bounded set.

**Proof.** By a similar proof as Theorem 2, we can get

$$\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_3 = \bar{C}_4 = \frac{(2 - 2^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 \eta^2}{8L^2}.$$

The proof of part (i) in the following lemma will be similar to Lemma 3.1 [10] (for NCP context) so we omit the proof.

**Lemma 8** Let  $\phi_{\theta,p} : \mathfrak{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be defined in (11). Then, for any  $p > 1$  and  $\theta \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$(i) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) |\min\{a, b\}| \leq |\phi_{\theta,p}(a, b)| \\ & \leq \left(2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) |\min\{a, b\}|. \end{aligned}$$

$$(ii) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left[2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x) \leq \Psi_{\theta,p}(x) \\ & \leq \left[2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right]^2 \Psi_{NR}(x). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 9** Let  $\psi_{\alpha,\theta,p} : \mathfrak{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be defined as (12). Then for any  $p > 1, \theta \in (0, 1]$  and  $\alpha \geq 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} |\min\{a, b\}|^2 \leq \psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(x) \\ & \leq \frac{(2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2}{2} |\min\{a, b\}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} \Psi_{NR}(x) \leq \Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(x) \\ & \leq \frac{(2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 + \alpha C_1^2}{2} \Psi_{NR}(x). \end{aligned}$$

for any  $a, b \in B_1$ , where  $B_1$  is a set such that  $\max_{x \in B_1} |x| \leq C_1$ .

**Proof.** Since for any  $a, b \in \mathfrak{R}$  and  $\max\{|a|, |b|\} \leq C_1$ , where  $C_1$  is defined in (13),

$$\begin{aligned} & [(ab)_+]^2 \leq a^2 b^2 \leq (\max\{|a|, |b|\})^2 (\min\{a, b\})^2 \\ & \leq C_1^2 (\min\{a, b\})^2 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Combining (15) and Lemma 8, and with the definition in (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(a, b) = \frac{\alpha}{2} [(ab)_+]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \phi_{\theta,p}(a, b)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \alpha C_1^2 + \left(2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)^2 \right) (\min\{a, b\})^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $a, b \in \mathfrak{R}$  and  $\max\{|a|, |b|\} \leq C_1$ .

**Theorem 6** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1$  and  $\theta \in (0, 1]$ , we have

$$\Psi_{\theta,p}(x) \leq \frac{(2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} nL^2 \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2,$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ .

**Proof.** By Lemma 8, we have

$$|r_i(x)| \leq L \text{dist}(x, X^*), \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Combining the inequality with Lemma 3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\theta,p}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n |\phi_{\theta,p}(f_i(x), g_i(x))|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)^2 r_i^2(x) \\ &\leq \frac{(2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} nL^2 \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete.

**Theorem 7** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ , and that  $f$  and  $g$  are relatively uniform **(P)**-functions with constant  $\eta > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1$ , we have

$$\Psi_{\theta,p}(x) \geq \frac{(2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 \eta^2}{8L^2} \|x - x^*\|^2,$$

for all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}^n$  and all  $x^* \in X^*$ .

**Proof.** From Lemma 2 and the property of  $f$  and  $g$  being relatively uniform **(P)**-functions, there exists at least one index  $i_0$  such that

$$|r_{i_0}(x)| \geq \frac{\eta}{2L} \|x - x^*\|,$$

which together with Lemma 3 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\theta,p}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_p^2(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \phi_p^2(f_{i_0}(x), g_{i_0}(x)) \\ &\geq \frac{(2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2}{2} |r_{i_0}(x)|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{(2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 \eta^2}{8L^2} \|x - x^*\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 8** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then any  $p > 1$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1]$  and  $\alpha \geq 0$ , there exists a constant  $\mathcal{C} > 0$  such that

$$\Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(x) \leq \mathcal{C} \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2, \quad \text{for all } x \in B,$$

where  $B$  is a bounded set.

**Proof.** From Lemma then for all  $x \in B$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(f_i(x), g_i(x)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \alpha C_1^2 + \left( 2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)^2 \right) r_i^2(x) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha C_1^2 + \left( 2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)^2}{2} nL^2 \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

for any  $x \in B$ . Denote  $\mathcal{C} := \frac{\alpha C_1^2 + \left( 2 + (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)^2}{2} nL^2$ , then  $\mathcal{C} > 0$  and  $\Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(x) \leq \mathcal{C} \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2$  for any  $x \in B$ .

**Theorem 9** Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous with constant  $L > 0$ , and that  $f$  and  $g$  are relatively uniform  $(\mathbf{P})$ -functions with constant  $\eta > 0$ . Suppose that the solution set  $X^*$  of GCP is nonempty. Then for any  $p > 1$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1]$  and  $\alpha \geq 0$ , we have

$$\Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(x) \geq \frac{(2 - (2\theta)^{\frac{1}{p}})^2 \eta^2}{8L^2} \text{dist}(x, X^*)^2, \quad \text{for all } x \in B,$$

where  $B$  is a bounded set.

**Proof.** The proof can be obtained in a similar way.

**Corollary 1** Under the assumptions that  $f$  and  $g$  are Lipschitz continuous and  $f$  and  $g$  are relatively uniform  $(\mathbf{P})$ -functions, the functions  $\sqrt{\Psi_p(x)}$  and  $\sqrt{\Psi_{\theta,p}(x)}$  provide lower and upper global error bounds for GCP( $f, g$ ); the functions  $\sqrt{\Psi_1(x)}$ ,  $\sqrt{\Psi_3(x)}$ ,  $\sqrt{\Psi_4(x)}$  and  $\sqrt{\Psi_{\alpha,\theta,p}(x)}$  provide lower and upper local error bounds for GCP( $f, g$ ).

**Final Remarks**

In this paper, we established global error bounds on the generalized complementarity problem, GCP( $f, g$ ), based on generalized Fischer-Burmeister function and its generalizations which are not only the extensions of those for the classical nonlinear complementarity problems but also new results for the nonlinear/generalized complementarity problems. For example, our results give various results for generalized complementarity problem when  $p$ -norm replace by 2-norm (or when  $p$  is an integer greater than 2). Also, when  $g(x) = x$ , our results further give a unified/generalization treatment of such results for the nonlinear complementarity problem based on generalized Fisher-Burmeister function and its generalizations.

Definitely, we may use the error bound estimation to establish quick convergence rate of the Newton-type method and derivative free algorithms for solving the GCP( $f, g$ ), this is a topic for future research by the authors. The results obtained in this paper can be taken as an extension of the existing global error bound for the classical nonlinear complementarity problems.

**Acknowledgments**

The research of the 1st author is supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). The postdoctoral fellowship of the 2nd author is supported by NSERC. The research of the 2nd author is supported in part by the National Natural Science foundation of China(Grant No.11301375; Grant No.71301118), Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (Grant No. 20120032120076), and Tianjin Planing Program of Philosophy and Social Science (Grant No. TJTJ11-004).

**References**

- [1] Jein-shan Chen, "On some NCP-functions based on the generalized Fischer-Burmeister function," Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 401-420, 2007.
- [2] Jein-shan Chen and Shao-hua Pan, "A family of NCP functions and a descent method for the nonlinear complementarity problems," Computational Optimization and Application, Vol. 40, pp. 389-404, 2008.
- [3] Jein-shan Chen, Hung-Ta Gao and Shao-hua Pan, "An R-linearly convergent derivative free algorithm for nonlinear complementarity problems based on the generalized Fischer-Burmeister merit function," Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 232, pp. 455-471, 2009.
- [4] R.W. Cottle, J.-S. Pang and R.E. Stone, *The linear complementarity problem*, Academic Press, Boston, 1992.
- [5] R.W. Cottle, F. Giannessi and J.-L. Lions (Eds.), *Variational inequalities and complementarity problems: Theory and applications*, J. Wiley, New York, 1980.
- [6] M. C. Ferris and O. L. Mangasarian, "Error bound and strong upper semicontinuity for monotone affine variational inequalities," Computer Sciences Department, University of Wisconsin, Technical Report 1056, 1992.
- [7] M. C. Ferris and J.-S. Pang (Eds.), *Complementarity and variational problems: State of the Art*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1997.
- [8] M. C. Ferris and J.-S. Pang, "Engineering and economic applications of complementarity problems," SIAM Review, Vol. 39, pp. 669-713, 1997.
- [9] F. Giannessi and A. Maugeri, *Variational Analysis and Applications*, Springer, New York, 2005.
- [10] W. Z. Gu and L. Y. Lu, "The linear convergence of a derivative-free descent method for nonlinear complementarity problems," submitted.
- [11] W. Gu and M. A. Tawhid, "Generalized complementarity problems based on generalized Fisher-Burmeister functions as unconstrained optimization," Advanced Modeling and Optimization, Vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 269-284, 2014.
- [12] Sheng-long Hu, Zheng-hai Huang and Jein-shan Chen, "Properties of a family of generalized NCP-functions and a derivative free algorithm for complementarity problems," Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 9(230), pp. 68-82, 2009.

- [13] P. T. Harker and J.-S. Pang, "Finite dimension variational inequality and nonlinear complementarity problems: A survey of theory, algorithms and applications," *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 48, pp. 161-220, 1990.
- [14] D. H. Hyer, G. Isac, and T.M. Rassias, *Topics in nonlinear analysis and applications*, World scientific Publishing Company, Singapore, 1997.
- [15] G. Isac, *Complementarity problems*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1528, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1992.
- [16] C. Kanzow and M. Fukushima, "Equivalence of the generalized complementarity problem to differentiable unconstrained minimization," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, Vol. 90, No. 3, pp. 581-603, 1996.
- [17] X. D. Luo and P. Tseng, "On global projection-type error bound for the linear complementarity problem," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, Vol. 253, Issues 13, pp. 251-278, 1997.
- [18] Z. Q. Luo, O.L. Mangasarian, J. Ren, and M. V. Solodov, "New error bound for the linear complementarity problem," *Math. Oper. Res.*, Vol. 19, pp. 880-892, 1994.
- [19] O. L. Mangasarian and J. Ren, "New error bounds for the nonlinear complementarity problem," *Communications on Applied Nonlinear Analysis*, Vol. 1, pp. 49-56, 1994.
- [20] O. L. Mangasarian and J. Ren, "New improved error bounds for the Linear complementarity problem," *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 66, pp. 241-255, 1994.
- [21] M. A. Noor, "Quasi-complementarity problem," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, Vol. 130, pp. 344-353, 1988.
- [22] M. A. Noor, "General nonlinear complementarity problems," *Analysis, Geometry, and Groups: A Riemann Legacy Volume*, Edited by H.M. Srivastava and T.M. Rassias, Hadronic Press, Palm Harbor, Florida, pp. 337-371, 1993.
- [23] J. S. Pang, "Error bounds in mathematical programming," *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 79, pp. 299-332, 1997.
- [24] J. S. Pang, "The implicit complementarity problem," *Nonlinear Programming*, Edited by O.L. Mangasarian, R. R. Meyer, and S. M. Robinson, Academic Press, New York, pp. 487-518, 1981.
- [25] G. Di Pillo and F. Giannessi (Eds.), *Nonlinear optimization and applications*, Plenum Press, New York, 1996.
- [26] H. C. Sun, Y. J. Wang, and L. Q. Qi, "Global error bound for the generalized linear complementarity problem over a polyhedral cone," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, Vol. 142, No. 2, pp. 417-429, 2009.
- [27] M. A. Tawhid, "An application of  $H$ -differentiability to nonnegative and unrestricted generalized complementarity," *Computation Optimization and Application*, Vol. 39, pp.51-74, 2008.
- [28] M. A. Tawhid and Weizhe Gu, "A dervative-free descent algorithms for solving generalized complementarity problems based on generalized Fisher-Burmeister functions," Submitted 2014
- [29] P. Tseng, "Global behaviour of a class of merit functions for the nonlinear complementarity problem," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, Vol. 89, pp. 17-37, 1996.
- [30] J. Z. Zhang, and N. H.Xiu, "Global  $s$ -type error bound for extended linear complementarity problem and

applications," *Math. Program. (Ser. B)*, Vol. 88, pp. 391410, 2000.



**Mohamed A. Tawhid** got his PhD in Applied Mathematics from the University of Maryland Baltimore County, Maryland, USA. From 2000 to 2002, he was a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Faculty of Management, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Currently,

he is a full professor at Thompson Rivers University. His research interests include nonlinear/stochastic/heuristic optimization, operations research, modelling and simulation, data analysis, and wireless sensor network. He has published in journals such as *Computational Optimization and Applications*, *J. Optimization and Engineering*, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, *European Journal of Operational Research*, *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization*, *Journal Applied Mathematics and Computation*, etc. Mohamed Tawhid published more than 40 referred papers and edited 4 special issues in *J. Optimization and Engineering (Springer)*, *J. Abstract and Applied Analysis*, *J. Advanced Modeling and Optimization*, and *International Journal of Distributed Sensor Networks*. Also, he has served on editorial board several journals.



**Wei-Zhe Gu** received the BS degree in Mathematics and Applied Mathematics in 2005 and PhD degree in Systems Engineering in 2010 from Tianjin University, Tianjin P.R.China. Since 2010, she has been a lecturer at Tianjin University. Her research interests are

optimization theory and methods.