


This article was downloaded by: [University from Craiova]

On: 30 June 2015, At: 23:58

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Optimization: A Journal of Mathematical Programming and Operations Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/gopt20>

Equilibrium problems techniques in the qualitative analysis of quasi-hemivariational inequalities

Boualem Alleche^a & Vicențiu D. Rădulescu^b

^a Laboratoire de Mécanique, Physique et Modélisation Mathématique, Université de Médéa, Médéa, Algeria.

^b Faculty of Science, Department of Mathematics, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

Published online: 12 May 2014.



CrossMark

[Click for updates](#)

To cite this article: Boualem Alleche & Vicențiu D. Rădulescu (2015) Equilibrium problems techniques in the qualitative analysis of quasi-hemivariational inequalities, Optimization: A Journal of Mathematical Programming and Operations Research, 64:9, 1855-1868, DOI: [10.1080/02331934.2014.917307](https://doi.org/10.1080/02331934.2014.917307)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02331934.2014.917307>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms &

Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Equilibrium problems techniques in the qualitative analysis of quasi-hemivariational inequalities

Boualem Alleche^a and Vicențiu D. Rădulescu^{b*}

^aLaboratoire de Mécanique, Physique et Modélisation Mathématique, Université de Médéa, Médéa, Algeria; ^bFaculty of Science, Department of Mathematics, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

(Received 5 January 2014; accepted 10 April 2014)

In this paper, we investigate the problem of existence of solutions of quasi-hemivariational inequalities. Some concepts of semicontinuity and hemicontinuity on subsets for functions as well as for set-valued mappings are developed and applied for solving quasi-hemivariational inequalities. Generalizations of some old results on the existence of solutions of equilibrium problems are obtained and applications to quasi-hemivariational inequalities are derived.

Keywords: quasi-hemivariational inequality; equilibrium problem; set-valued mapping; lower semicontinuity; hemicontinuity; Vietoris topology

AMS Subject Classifications: 47J20; 47H04; 49J53; 54C60; 47H05

1. Introduction

Let E be a real Banach space which is continuously embedded in $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, for some $1 < p < +\infty$ and $n \geq 1$, where Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^m , $m \geq 1$. Let i be the canonical injection of E into $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$.

The aim of this paper is to study the existence of solutions for the following quasi-hemivariational inequality:

$$\text{Find } u \in E \text{ and } u^* \in A(u) \text{ such that} \\ \langle u^*, v \rangle_E + h(u)J^0(iu; iv) \geq \langle Fu, v \rangle_E \quad \forall v \in E, \quad (1.1)$$

where $A : E \rightrightarrows E^*$ is a nonlinear set-valued mapping, $F : E \rightarrow E^*$ is a nonlinear operator, $J : L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a locally Lipschitzian functional and $h : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a given nonnegative functional.

We point out that if $h = 0$ in problem (1.1) then we obtain the standard case of *variational inequalities*, see Lions and Stampacchia [1] and Kinderlehrer and Stampacchia [2]. The setting corresponding to $h \equiv 1$ in (1.1) describes the *hemivariational inequalities*, which were introduced by Panagiotopoulos [3,4]. These inequality problems appear as a

*Corresponding author. Email: vicentiu.radulescu@math.cnrs.fr

generalization of variational inequalities, but they are much more general than these ones, in the sense that they are not equivalent to minimum problems but give rise to substationarity problems. The general case when h is nonconstant corresponds to *quasi-hemivariational inequalities*, which were first studied by Naniewicz and Panagiotopoulos [5, Section 4.5], in relationship with relevant models in mechanics and engineering. We refer to Rădulescu [6], Wangkeeree and Preechasilp [7] for recent contributions to the qualitative analysis of hemivariational and quasi-hemivariational inequalities.

The quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.1) has been recently studied in Costea and Rădulescu [8]. For technical reasons, the authors considered the following quasi-hemivariational inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Find } u \in C \text{ and } u^* \in A(u) \text{ such that} \\ & \langle u^*, v - u \rangle_E + h(u)J^0(iu; iv - iu) \geq \langle Fu, v - u \rangle_E \quad \forall v \in C \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

where C is a nonempty, closed and convex subset of E satisfying some additional conditions. Several results on the existence of solutions of the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) have been obtained in two cases: (i) when C is a nonempty, convex and compact subset of E ; and (ii) when C is a nonempty, convex, closed and bounded (then weakly compact) subset of a reflexive Banach space. Characterizations and applications for solving the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.1) are derived.

Clearly, if C is a linear subspace and in particular, if C is the whole space E , then the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) is equivalent to the following quasi-hemivariational inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Find } u \in C \text{ and } u^* \in A(u) \text{ such that} \\ & \langle u^*, v \rangle_E + h(u)J^0(iu; iv) \geq \langle Fu, v \rangle_E \quad \forall v \in C \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the formulation of the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.1) with E replaced by C .

In this paper, we follow a direct approach by studying the existence of solutions of the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) when C is a nonempty, closed and convex subset of E . It follows that all the results obtained can be then applied to the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.1).

This paper is organized as follows. In the second section, we introduce some concepts of continuity of functions and set-valued mappings and obtain some results and characterizations.

In the third section, we introduce a coercivity condition on a compact or weakly compact subset and use the concept of continuity on a subset for solving the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) when C is a nonempty, closed and convex subset of E .

In the last section of the paper, we obtain some results on the existence of solutions of equilibrium problems by using the concept of continuity on a subset of equilibrium bifunctions in their first or second variable. Applications for solving quasi-hemivariational inequalities are given.

2. Notations and preliminary results

For a given Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$, we denote by X^* its dual space and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$ (or simply by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ if no confusion may arise), the duality pairing between X^* and X .

Recall that a function $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *locally Lipschitzian* if for every $u \in X$, there exists a neighbourhood U of u and a constant $L_u > 0$ such that

$$|\phi(w) - \phi(v)| \leq L_u \|w - v\|_X \quad \forall u \in U, \forall v \in U.$$

If $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally Lipschitzian near $u \in X$, then the *generalized directional derivative* of ϕ at u in the direction of $v \in X$, denoted by $\phi^0(u, v)$, is defined by

$$\phi^0(u, v) = \limsup_{\substack{w \rightarrow u \\ \lambda \downarrow 0}} \frac{\phi(w + \lambda v) - \phi(w)}{\lambda}.$$

Among several important properties of the generalized directional derivative of locally Lipschitzian functions, we will make use in the present paper of the following properties (for proofs and related properties, we refer to Clarke [9, Proposition 2.1.1]).

Suppose that $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally Lipschitzian near $u \in X$. Then,

- (1) the function $v \mapsto \phi^0(u, v)$ is finite, positively homogeneous and subadditive;
- (2) the function $(u, v) \mapsto \phi^0(u, v)$ is upper semicontinuous.

Before introducing some concepts of continuity we need in the paper, we recall here some general results on convergence of sequences.

Let X be a Hausdorff topological space. Recall that a subset B of X is said to be *sequentially closed* if whenever $(x_n)_n$ is a sequence in B converging to x , then $x \in B$. As well known, a space is called *sequential* if every sequentially closed subset is closed. Every metric space and more generally, every Fréchet-Urysohn space is a sequential space. A space X is called *Fréchet-Urysohn space* if whenever x is in the closure of a subset B of X , there exists a sequence in B converging to x , see Engelking [10], Alleche and Calbrix [11] for further details.

The weak topology of Banach spaces is not sequential in general. However, bounded subsets of reflexive Banach spaces that endowed with the weak topology have the following property: if a point x is in the weak closure of a bounded subset B of a reflexive Banach space, then there exists a sequence in B weakly converging to x (see Denkowski et al. [12, Proposition [3.6.23]). Thus, every bounded and weakly sequentially closed subset of a reflexive Banach space is closed.

We say that a subset B has the *Fréchet-Urysohn property* if whenever x is in the closure of B , there exists a sequence in B converging to x . Every subset of a Fréchet-Urysohn space has the Fréchet-Urysohn property. Also there are some other interesting unbounded subsets of Banach spaces which have the Fréchet-Urysohn property, see Dilworth [13].

In the sequel, for a subset B of X , we denote by

$$\text{Exp}(B) = \{x \in X \mid \exists (x_n)_n, x_n \in B, \forall n, x_n \rightarrow x\},$$

the sequential explosion of B . Of course, $\text{Exp}(B)$ is neither closed nor sequentially closed in general.

Let $x \in X$. A function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called

- (1) *sequentially upper semicontinuous at x* if for every sequence $(x_n)_n$ in X converging to x , we have

$$f(x) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(x_n)$$

where $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(x_n) = \inf_n \sup_{k \geq n} f(x_k)$.

- (2) *sequentially lower semicontinuous at x* if $-f$ is sequentially upper semicontinuous at x , that is, for every sequence $(x_n)_n$ of X converging to x , we have

$$f(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(x_n)$$

where $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(x_n) = \sup_n \inf_{k \geq n} f(x_k)$.

The function f is said to be *sequentially upper* (resp. *sequentially lower*) *semicontinuous* on a subset S of X if it is sequentially upper (resp. sequentially lower) semicontinuous at every point of S .

If sequences are replaced by generalized sequences (nets) in the above definition of sequentially upper (resp. sequentially lower) semicontinuous function, we obtain the notion of upper (resp. lower) semicontinuous function.

The following result shows how easy is to construct sequentially upper (resp. sequentially lower) semicontinuous functions on a subset which are not sequentially upper (resp. sequentially lower) semicontinuous on the whole space.

PROPOSITION 2.1 *Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and let S be a subset of X . If the restriction $f|_U$ of f on an open subset U containing S is sequentially upper (resp. sequentially lower) semicontinuous, then any extension of $f|_U$ to the space X is a sequentially upper (resp. sequentially lower) semicontinuous function on S .*

The following lemma provides us some properties of sequentially upper and sequentially lower semicontinuous functions on a subset.

PROPOSITION 2.2 *Let $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function, S a subset of X and $a \in \mathbb{R}$.*

- (1) *If f is sequentially upper semicontinuous on S , then*

$$\text{Exp}(\{x \in X \mid f(x) \geq a\}) \cap S = \{x \in S \mid f(x) \geq a\}.$$

Moreover, the trace on S of upper level sets of f are sequentially closed in S .

- (2) *If f is sequentially lower semicontinuous on S , then*

$$\text{Exp}(\{x \in X \mid f(x) \leq a\}) \cap S = \{x \in S \mid f(x) \leq a\}.$$

Moreover, the trace on S of lower level sets of f are sequentially closed in S .

Proof The second statement being similar to the first, we prove only the case of the sequential upper semicontinuity. Let

$$x^* \in \text{Exp}(\{x \in X \mid f(x) \geq a\}) \cap S.$$

Let $(x_n)_n$ be a sequence in $\text{Exp}(\{x \in X \mid f(x) \geq a\})$ converging to x^* . Since $x^* \in S$, then by the sequential upper semicontinuity of f on S , we have

$$f(x^*) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(x_n) \geq a.$$

Thus, $x^* \in \{x \in S \mid f(x) \geq a\}$. The converse holds from the fact that

$$\{x \in S \mid f(x) \geq a\} = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \geq a\} \cap S,$$

which is obvious as well as the sequential closeness in S of the trace on S of upper level sets of f . □

The notions of upper and lower hemicontinuity are generalizations of the notions of sequential lower and sequential upper semicontinuity, respectively, when the space X is a real topological Hausdorff vector space. Recall that $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *upper hemicontinuous* at $x \in X$ if the restriction of f on any segment containing x is sequentially upper semicontinuous at x . It is called *lower hemicontinuous* at $x \in X$ if $-f$ is upper hemicontinuous at x .

The notions of upper and lower semicontinuity of set-valued mappings are the most known generalizations of the notion of continuity of functions to set-valued mappings.

Let X and Y be Hausdorff topological spaces. Recall that a set-valued mapping $T : X \rightrightarrows Y$ is said to be *lower semicontinuous* at $x \in X$, if for every open subset V of Y such that $V \cap T(x) \neq \emptyset$, there exists an open neighbourhood U of x such that $V \cap T(x') \neq \emptyset$ for all $x' \in U$. Equivalently, $T : X \rightrightarrows Y$ is lower semicontinuous at $x \in X$ provided that T is continuous at x as a function from X to the hyperspace of subsets of Y endowed with the lower Vietoris topology. If the lower Vietoris topology is replaced by the upper Vietoris topology, then we obtain the definition of *the upper semicontinuity* of T at x , see Papageorgiou and Kyritsi-Yiallourou [14].

T is said to be lower semicontinuous on a subset S of X if T is lower semicontinuous at every point of S .

Here we introduce a generalization of lower semicontinuity of set-valued functions when the space X is a real topological Hausdorff vector space. We say that a set-valued mapping $T : X \rightrightarrows Y$ is *lower quasi-hemicontinuous* at $x \in X$, if whenever $z \in X$ and $(\lambda_n)_n$ a sequence in $]0, 1[$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_n = 0$, there exists a sequence $(z_n^*)_n$ converging to some element x^* of $T(x)$ such that $z_n^* \in T(x + \lambda_n(z - x))$, for every n .

The set-valued function T will be said lower quasi-hemicontinuous on a subset S of X if T is lower quasi-hemicontinuous at every point of S .

The following result shows that the notion of quasi-hemicontinuity of set-valued mappings is also a generalization of different other notions.

PROPOSITION 2.3 *Let $T : X \rightrightarrows Y$ be a set-valued mapping and suppose that one of the following assumption hold:*

- (1) T is lower semicontinuous at $x \in X$;
- (2) T has a continuous selection.

Then T is lower quasi-hemicontinuous at x .

Proof The second statement is obvious. The first comes from the fact that T is lower semicontinuous at $x \in X$ if and only if for every generalized sequence $(x_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ converging to x , and for every $x^* \in T(x)$, there exists a generalized sequence $(x_\lambda^*)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ converging to x^* such that $x_\lambda^* \in T(x_\lambda)$, for every $\lambda \in \Lambda$, see Papageorgiou and Kyritsi-Yiallourou [14, Proposition 6.1.4]. \square

Although the notion of semicontinuity of set-valued mappings is important for the existence of continuous selections (Michael's selection theorem), it is not essential. This means that under additional conditions, different continuous set-valued mappings with respect to other hyperspace topology may have continuous selections and then, they are lower quasi-hemicontinuous. For further details on selection theory of set-valued mappings, we refer to Papageorgiou and Kyritsi-Yiallourou [14], Aubin and Frankowska [15], Repovš and Semenov [16].

As in Proposition 2.1, the following result shows how easily we construct lower quasi-hemicontinuous set-valued mapping on a subset without being lower quasi-hemicontinuous on the whole space.

PROPOSITION 2.4 *Let $T : X \rightrightarrows Y$ be a set-valued mapping and let S be a subset of X . If the restriction $T|_U$ of T on an open and convex subset U containing S is lower quasi-hemicontinuous, then any extension of $T|_U$ to the space X is a lower quasi-hemicontinuous set-valued mapping on S .*

A set-valued mapping $T : E \rightrightarrows 2^{E^*}$ is said to be *relaxed α -monotone* if there exists a functional $\alpha : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $u, v \in E$, we have

$$\langle v^* - u^*, v - u \rangle \geq \alpha(v - u) \quad \forall u^* \in T(u), \forall v^* \in T(v).$$

3. Existence results for quasi-hemivariational inequalities

For any $v \in C$, we define the following set:

$$\Theta(v) = \left\{ u \in C \mid \inf_{v^* \in A(v)} \langle v^*, v - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iv - iu) - \langle Fu, v - u \rangle \geq \alpha(v - u) \right\}.$$

The following result should be compared with Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in Costea and Rădulescu [8]. It provides us a result on the existence of solutions of quasi-hemivariational inequalities.

THEOREM 3.1 *Let C be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of the real Banach space E which is continuously imbedded in $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Suppose that the following assumptions hold:*

- (1) *there exists a compact subset K of C and $v_0 \in K$ such that the following condition holds: for every $u \in C \setminus K$, there exists $v^* \in A(v_0)$ such that*

$$\langle v^*, v_0 - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iv_0 - iu) - \langle Fu, v_0 - u \rangle - \alpha(v_0 - u) < 0;$$

- (2) *$\alpha : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a functional such that for every $u \in C$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\alpha(\lambda_n u)}{\lambda_n} = 0$ whenever $(\lambda_n)_n$ is a sequence in $]0, 1[$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_n = 0$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha(u_n) \geq \alpha(u)$ whenever $(u_n)_n$ is a sequence in C converging to u ;*
 (3) *A is relaxed α -monotone and lower quasi-hemicontinuous on K with respect to the weak* topology of E^* ;*
 (4) *h is a nonnegative sequentially lower semicontinuous functional on K ;*
 (5) *F is an operator such that for every $v \in C$, $u \mapsto \langle Fu, v - u \rangle$ is sequentially lower semicontinuous on K .*

Then, the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) has at least one solution.

Proof By using the relaxed α -monotonicity of A and the subadditivity of the function $v \mapsto J^0(iu; iv)$, we obtain that the set-valued mapping $v \mapsto \Theta(v)$ is a KKM mapping. To do this, let $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\} \subset C$ and put $u_0 = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k v_k$ where $\lambda_k \in]0, 1[$ for every $k = 1, \dots, n$ and $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = 1$. Assume that $u_0 \notin \bigcup_{k=1}^n \Theta(v_k)$, then for every $k = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\inf_{v^* \in A(v_k)} \langle v^*, v_k - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iv_k - iu_0) - \langle Fu, v_k - u_0 \rangle < \alpha(v_k - u_0).$$

For every $k = 1, \dots, n$, choose $v_k^* \in A(v_k)$ such that

$$\langle v_k^*, v_k - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iv_k - iu_0) - \langle Fu, v_k - u_0 \rangle < \alpha(v_k - u_0).$$

Since A is relaxed α -monotone, then for every $u_0^* \in A(u_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_k^*, v_k - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iv_k - iu_0) - \langle Fu, v_k - u_0 \rangle &< \alpha(v_k - u_0) \\ &\leq \langle v_k^* - u_0^*, v_k - u_0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\langle u_0^*, v_k - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iv_k - iu_0) - \langle Fu, v_k - u_0 \rangle < 0 \quad \forall u_0^* \in A(u_0).$$

Since the function $v \mapsto J^0(iu; iv)$ is subadditive, then for any $u_0^* \in A(u_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle u_0^*, u_0 - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iu_0 - iu_0) - \langle Fu, u_0 - u_0 \rangle \\ &= \left\langle u_0^*, \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k (v_k - u_0) \right\rangle + h(u_0)J^0\left(iu_0; \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k (iv_k - iu_0)\right) \\ &\quad - \left\langle Fu, \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k (v_k - u_0) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k \left(\langle u_0^*, v_k - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iv_k - iu_0) - \langle Fu, v_k - u_0 \rangle \right) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction and then the set-valued mapping $v \mapsto \Theta(v)$ is a KKM mapping. Since $\Theta(v_0)$ is contained in K which is compact, then by Ky Fan's lemma [17], we have

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \overline{\Theta(v)} \neq \emptyset.$$

Now, we will prove that for every $v \in C$, we have

$$\overline{\Theta(v)} \cap K = \Theta(v) \cap K.$$

To do this, let $v \in C$ and $u \in \overline{\Theta(v)} \cap K$. Let $(u_n)_n$ be a sequence in $\Theta(v)$ converging to u . Let $v^* \in A(v)$ be arbitrary. We have for all $n \geq 1$

$$\alpha(v - u_n) \leq \langle v^*, v - u_n \rangle + h(u_n)J^0(iu_n; iv - iu_n) - \langle Fu_n, v - u_n \rangle.$$

Since $u \in K$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(v - u) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha(v - u_n) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\langle v^*, v - u_n \rangle + h(u_n)J^0(iu_n; iv - iu_n) - \langle Fu_n, v - u_n \rangle \right) \\ &\leq \langle v^*, v - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iv - iu) - \langle Fu, v - u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $u \in \Theta(v) \cap K$.

Now, by using the fact that $\Theta(v_0)$ is contained in K , we conclude that

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \overline{\Theta(v)} = \bigcap_{v \in C} \Theta(v),$$

and then,

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \Theta(v) \neq \emptyset.$$

Finally, let $u_0 \in \bigcap_{v \in C} \Theta(v)$. This means that $u_0 \in K$ and for every $w \in C$, we have

$$\inf_{w^* \in A(w)} \langle w^*, w - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iw - iu) - \langle Fu, w - u \rangle \geq \alpha(w - u).$$

Let $v \in C$ be arbitrary and define $w_n = u_0 + \lambda_n(v - u_0)$ where $(\lambda_n)_n$ is a sequence in $]0, 1[$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_n = 0$. By lower quasi-hemicontinuity of A on K , let $w_n^* \in A(w_n)$ be such that $w_n^* \xrightarrow{w^*} u_0^* \in A(u_0)$. Since the function $v \mapsto J^0(iu; iv)$ is positively homogeneous, we obtain

$$\langle w_n^*, v - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iv - iu_0) - \langle Fu_0, v - u_0 \rangle \geq \frac{\alpha(\lambda_n(v - u_0))}{\lambda_n}.$$

Letting n go to $+\infty$, we obtain that

$$\langle u_0^*, v - u_0 \rangle + h(u_0)J^0(iu_0; iv - iu_0) - \langle Fu_0, v - u_0 \rangle \geq 0$$

which completes the proof. \square

The following result is a generalization of Theorem 3.2 in Costea and Rădulescu [8]. It provides us with a second result on the existence of solutions of quasi-hemivariational inequalities.

THEOREM 3.2 *Let C be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of the real reflexive Banach space E which is compactly imbedded in $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Suppose that the following hypotheses are fulfilled:*

- (1) *there exist a weakly compact subset K of C and $v_0 \in K$ such that the following condition holds: for every $u \in C \setminus K$, there exists $v^* \in A(v_0)$ such that*

$$\langle v^*, v_0 - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iv_0 - iu) - \langle Fu, v_0 - u \rangle - \alpha(v_0 - u) < 0;$$

- (2) *$\alpha : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a functional such that for every $u \in C$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\alpha(\lambda_n u)}{\lambda_n} = 0$ whenever $(\lambda_n)_n$ is a sequence in $]0, 1[$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda_n = 0$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha(u_n) \geq \alpha(u)$ whenever $(u_n)_n$ is a sequence in C weakly converging to u ;*
- (3) *A is relaxed α -monotone and lower quasi-hemicontinuous on K with respect to the weak* topology of E^* ;*
- (4) *h is a nonnegative weakly sequentially lower semicontinuous functional on K ;*
- (5) *F is an operator such that for every $v \in C$, $u \mapsto \langle Fu, v - u \rangle$ is weakly sequentially lower semicontinuous on K .*

Then the function $v \mapsto \Theta(v)$ is a KKM mapping and

$$Exp(\Theta(v)) \cap K = \Theta(v) \cap K \quad \forall v \in C.$$

If, in addition, $\Theta(v)$ has the Fréchet-Urysohn property, for every $v \in C$, then the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) has at least one solution.

Proof By the same proof as in Theorem 3.1, we obtain that the set-valued mapping $v \mapsto \Theta(v)$ is a KKM mapping.

Now, let $v \in C$ and $u \in Exp(\Theta(v)) \cap K$. Let $(u_n)_n$ be a sequence in $\Theta(v)$ weakly converging to u . Since the compact embedding i is compact, it maps weakly convergent sequences into strongly convergent sequences (see for example, Renardy and Rogers [18, Theorem 8.84]). Let $v^* \in A(v)$ be arbitrary. We have

$$\alpha(v - u_n) \leq \langle v^*, v - u_n \rangle + h(u_n)J^0(iu_n; iv - iu_n) - \langle Fu_n, v - u_n \rangle \quad \forall n.$$

Since $u \in K$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(v - u) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha(v - u_n) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\langle v^*, v - u_n \rangle + h(u_n)J^0(iu_n; iv - iu_n) - \langle Fu_n, v - u_n \rangle \right) \\ &\leq \langle v^*, v - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iv - iu) - \langle Fu, v - u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $u \in \Theta(v) \cap K$.

Suppose now that $\Theta(v)$ has the Fréchet-Urysohn property, for every $v \in C$. Then

$$Exp(\Theta(v)) = \overline{\Theta(v)} \quad \forall v \in C$$

where the closure is taken with respect to the weak topology. Since the set-valued mapping $v \mapsto \Theta(v)$ is a KKM mapping and since $\Theta(v_0)$ is contained in K which is weakly compact, then by Ky Fan's lemma, we have

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \text{Exp}(\Theta(v)) \neq \emptyset.$$

By the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we conclude that

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \text{Exp}(\Theta(v)) = \bigcap_{v \in C} \Theta(v),$$

and then,

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \Theta(v) \neq \emptyset.$$

Also, by a similar proof as in Theorem 3.1, we conclude that the quasi-hemivariational problem (1.2) has at least one solution. \square

4. Equilibrium problems vs. quasi-hemivariational inequality problems and applications

Equilibrium problems are very general and they include as particular cases, Nash equilibrium problems and convex minimization problems. Relevant applications in physics, optimization and economics are described by models based on equilibrium problems.

Let C be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of a real topological Hausdorff vector space X . An *equilibrium problem* in the sense of Blum, Muu and Oettli [19,20] (see also Alleche [21,22], Bianchi and Schaible [23], Hadjisavvas and Schaible [24], and the references therein) is a problem of the form:

$$\text{Find } u \in C \text{ such that } \Phi(u, v) \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in C \quad (4.1)$$

where $\Phi : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bifunction such that $\Phi(u, u) \geq 0$, for every $u \in C$. Such a bifunction is called an *equilibrium bifunction*.

We present in this section some results about the existence of solutions of equilibrium problems and apply these results for solving quasi-hemivariational inequalities.

In the sequel, we define the following sets: for every $v \in C$, we put

$$\Phi^+(v) = \{u \in C \mid \Phi(u, v) \geq 0\}$$

and

$$\Phi^-(v) = \{u \in C \mid \Phi(v, u) \leq 0\}.$$

Recall that a function $f : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be

- (1) *semistrictly quasiconvex* on C if, for every $u_1, u_2 \in C$ such that $f(u_1) \neq f(u_2)$, we have

$$f(\lambda u_1 + (1 - \lambda) u_2) < \max \{f(u_1), f(u_2)\} \quad \forall \lambda \in]0, 1[.$$

- (2) explicitly quasiconvex on C if it is quasiconvex and semistrictly quasiconvex (see e.g. Avriel et al. [25]).

The following result extends the well-known Ky Fan’s minimax inequality theorem (see Fan [26], Kassay [27], Konnov [28]) for sequentially upper semicontinuous bifunctions on their first variable on a subset of a real Banach space.

THEOREM 4.1 *Let C be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of the real Banach space E . Let $\Phi : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium bifunction and suppose that the following assumptions hold:*

- (1) Φ is quasiconvex in its second variable on C ;
- (2) there exists a compact subset K of C and $v_0 \in K$ such that

$$\Phi(u, v_0) < 0 \quad \forall u \in C \setminus K;$$

- (3) Φ is sequentially upper semicontinuous in its first variable on K .

Then the equilibrium problem (4.1) has a solution.

Proof Since Φ is an equilibrium bifunction, then $\overline{\Phi^+(v)}$ is nonempty and closed, for every $v \in C$.

By quasiconvexity of Φ in its second variable, the mapping $v \mapsto \Phi^+(v)$ is a KKM mapping (see e.g. Alleche [22], Bianchi and Schaible [23], Fan [17,26], Kassay [27]), and since $\Phi^+(v_0)$ is contained in the compact subset K , then by Ky Fan’s lemma, we have

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \overline{\Phi^+(v)} \neq \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \overline{\Phi^+(v)} = \bigcap_{v \in C} (\overline{\Phi^+(v)} \cap K).$$

Since

$$\text{Exp}(\Phi^+(v)) = \overline{\Phi^+(v)} \quad \forall v \in C,$$

then by Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\overline{\Phi^+(v)} \cap K = \Phi^+(v) \cap K \quad \forall v \in C.$$

Thus,

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \Phi^+(v) = \bigcap_{v \in C} \overline{\Phi^+(v)} \neq \emptyset$$

which completes the proof. □

As well known in the literature, the equilibrium problem (4.1) can be also solved when the bifunction Φ is not upper semicontinuous on its first variable. In this case, some additional conditions are needed.

The bifunction $\Phi : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *pseudomonotone* on C if

$$\Phi(u, v) \geq 0 \implies \Phi(v, u) \leq 0, \quad \forall u, v \in C.$$

The following result extends (under the settings of the real Banach space E) some results of Alleche [22], Bianchi and Schaible [23] on the existence of solutions for pseudomonotone equilibrium problems.

THEOREM 4.2 *Let C be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of the real Banach space E . Let $\Phi : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium bifunction and suppose that the following assumptions hold:*

- (1) Φ is pseudomonotone on C ;
- (2) there exists a compact subset K of C and $v_0 \in K$ such that

$$\Phi(u, v_0) < 0 \quad \forall u \in C \setminus K;$$
- (3) Φ is upper hemicontinuous in its first variable on K ;
- (4) Φ is explicitly quasiconvex in its second variable on C ;
- (5) Φ is sequentially lower semicontinuous in its second variable on K .

Then, the equilibrium problem (4.1) has a solution.

Proof By the same proof as in Theorem 4.1, we obtain that

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} (\overline{\Phi^+(v)} \cap K) = \bigcap_{v \in C} \overline{\Phi^+(v)} \neq \emptyset.$$

Since Φ is sequentially lower semicontinuous in its second variable on K , then by applying Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\overline{\Phi^-(v)} \cap K = \Phi^-(v) \cap K \quad \forall v \in C.$$

From pseudo-monotonicity, we have $\Phi^+(v) \subset \Phi^-(v)$, for every $v \in C$. It follows that

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} (\overline{\Phi^+(v)} \cap K) \subset \bigcap_{v \in C} (\Phi^-(v) \cap K).$$

By using the hemicontinuity of Φ in its first variable on K and the explicit quasi-convexity (see Alleche [22, Lemma 2.4]), we have

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} (\Phi^-(v) \cap K) \subset \bigcap_{v \in C} \Phi^+(v).$$

A combination of the above statements yields

$$\bigcap_{v \in C} \overline{\Phi^+(v)} = \bigcap_{v \in C} \Phi^+(v).$$

This completes the proof. □

Of course, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 remain true if the real Banach space E is replaced by a real topological Hausdorff vector space such that the subset C is a Fréchet-Urysohn space.

Now we apply the above theorems to derive results on the existence of solution of quasi-hemivariational inequalities.

Define the equilibrium bifunction $\Psi : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Psi(u, v) = \inf_{v^* \in A(v)} \langle v^*, v - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iv - iu) - \langle Fu, v - u \rangle.$$

Although we are aware of the intrinsic properties of the generalized directional derivative, we do not know if Ψ satisfies any condition of continuity or of convexity in its first or second variable. In other words, even under assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, it is not clear whether Ψ satisfies any condition of Theorem 4.1 or Theorem 4.2.

The following result provides us with a sufficient condition for solving the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2). Note that the concept of relaxed α -monotonicity is no longer needed.

THEOREM 4.3 *Let C be a nonempty, closed and convex subset of the real Banach space E . Suppose that A is lower quasi-hemicontinuous on K with respect to the weak* topology of E^* . If the equilibrium problem*

$$\text{find } u \in C \text{ such that } \Psi(u, v) \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in C$$

has a solution, then the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) has a solution.

Let us point out that by a classical method, we can also define an equilibrium bifunction $\Psi : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\Psi(u, v) = \sup_{u^* \in A(u)} \langle u^*, v - u \rangle + h(u)J^0(iu; iv - iu) - \langle Fu, v - u \rangle.$$

Clearly, any solution of the quasi-hemivariational inequality problem (1.2) is a solution of the equilibrium problem

$$\text{Find } u \in C \text{ such that } \Psi(u, v) \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in C. \tag{4.2}$$

The converse does not hold easily as in Theorem 4.3 and it seems to need additional conditions on the values of the set-valued mapping A .

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for the careful reading of this paper and for their useful remarks. V. Rădulescu would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the programme *Free Boundary Problems and Related Topics*, where work on this paper was undertaken.

References

[1] Lions JL, Stampacchia G. Variational inequalities. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 1967;20:493–519.
 [2] Kinderlehrer D, Stampacchia G. An introduction to variational inequalities. New York (NY): Academic Press; 1980.
 [3] Panagiotopoulos PD. Nonconvex energy functions. Hemivariational inequalities and substationarity principles. *Acta. Mech.* 1983;42:160–183.

- [4] Panagiotopoulos PD. Inequality problems in mechanics and applications: convex and nonconvex energy functions. Boston (MA): Birkhäuser; 1985.
- [5] Naniewicz Z, Panagiotopoulos PD. Mathematical theory of hemivariational inequalities and applications. New York (NY): Marcel Dekker; 1995.
- [6] Rădulescu V. Qualitative analysis of nonlinear elliptic partial differential equations. Vol. 6, Contemporary mathematics and its applications. New York (NY): Hindawi; 2008.
- [7] Wangkeeree R, Preechasilp P. Existence theorems of the hemivariational inequality governed by a multi-valued map perturbed with a nonlinear term in Banach spaces. *J. Glob. Optim.* 2013;57:1447–1464.
- [8] Costea C, Rădulescu V. Inequality problems of quasi-hemivariational type involving set-valued operators and a nonlinear term. *J. Glob. Optim.* 2012;52:743–756.
- [9] Clarke FH. Optimization and nonsmooth analysis. SIAM ed. Philadelphia (PA): Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics; 1990.
- [10] Engelking R. General topology. Berlin: Heldermann Verlag; 1989.
- [11] Alleche B, Calbrix J. On the coincidence of the upper Kuratowski topology with the cocompact topology. *Topology Appl.* 1999;93:207–218.
- [12] Denkowski Z, Migórski S, Papageorgiou NS. An introduction to nonlinear analysis: theory. Library of Congress. New York (NY): Kluwer Academic; 2003.
- [13] Dilworth SJ. A weak topology characterization of $\ell_1(m)$. In: Müller PFX, Schachermayer W, editors. Geometry of Banach spaces. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1991. p. 89–94. Proceedings of the Conference Held in Strobl, Austria; 1989.
- [14] Papageorgiou NS, Kyritsi-Yiallourou STH. Handbook of applied analysis. Vol. 19, Advances in mechanics and mathematics. Dordrecht: Springer; 2009.
- [15] Aubin JP, Frankowska H. Set-valued analysis. Boston (MA): Birkhäuser; 1990.
- [16] Repovš D, Semenov PV. Continuous selections of multivalued mappings. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic; 1998.
- [17] Fan K. A generalization of Tychonoff's fixed point theorem. *Math. Ann.* 1961;142:305–310.
- [18] Renardy M, Rogers RC. An introduction to partial differential equations. 2nd ed. New York (NY): Springer-Verlag; 2004.
- [19] Blum E, Oettli W. From optimization and variational inequalities to equilibrium problems. *Math. Stud.* 1994;63:123–145.
- [20] Muu LD, Oettli W. Convergence of an adaptive penalty scheme for finding constrained equilibria. *Nonlinear Anal. TMA.* 1992;18:1159–1166.
- [21] Alleche B. Multivalued mixed variational inequalities with locally Lipschitzian and locally cocoercive multivalued mappings. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 2013;399:625–637.
- [22] Alleche B. On hemicontinuity of bifunctions for solving equilibrium problems. *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.* 2014;3:69–80.
- [23] Bianchi M, Schaible S. Generalized monotone bifunctions and equilibrium problems. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 1996;90:31–43.
- [24] Hadjisavvas N, Schaible S. Generalized monotonicity: applications to variational inequalities and equilibrium problems. In: Floudas CA, Pardalos PM, editors. Encyclopedia of optimization. New York (NY): Springer; 2009. p. 1202–1209.
- [25] Avriel M, Diewert WE, Schaible S, Zang I. Generalized concavity. New York (NY): Plenum Press; 1988.
- [26] Fan K. A minimax inequality and its application. In: Shisha O, editor. Inequalities. Vol. 3. New York (NY): Academic Press; 1972. p. 103–113.
- [27] Kassay G. On equilibrium problems. In: Chinchuluun A, Pardalos PM, Enkhbat R, Tseveendorj I, editors. Optimization and optimal control: theory and applications. Vol. 39, Optimization and its applications. Springer; 2010. p. 55–83.
- [28] Konnov I. Combined relaxation methods for variational inequalities. Berlin: Springer; 2001.