

อภิปรายผลการ

สัญญาเลขที่ R2560



สำนักหอสมุด

## รายงานวิจัยฉบับสมบูรณ์

การลู่เข้าแบบ Painleve-Kuratowski ของเซตผลเฉลยสำหรับปัญหาแก๊งเชิง

ดุลยภาพแบบเวกเตอร์อย่างเข้ม

รองศาสตราจารย์ ดร.ระเบียน วังศิริ

ภาควิชาคณิตศาสตร์ คณะวิทยาศาสตร์

สำนักหอสมุด มหาวิทยาลัยนเรศวร

วันลงทะเบียน 1 ส.ค. 2562

เลขทะเบียน 1020499

เลขเรียกหนังสือ ๖ ๑๙

423

๕๒๕๕

๒๕๖๐

สนับสนุนโดย

งบประมาณรายได้มหาวิทยาลัยนเรศวร

ปีงบประมาณ 2560

# Executive Summary

## 1 ความสำคัญและที่มาของปัญหาที่ทำการวิจัย

The vector equilibrium problems contain many problems as special cases, including vector variational inequality problems, vector optimization problems, vector complementarity problems, vector Nash equilibrium problems, etc. Because of the general form of this problem, in fact it was investigated earlier under other terminologies (see, [8, 20, 4]). Recently, there has been an increasing interest in the study to stability of vector equilibrium problems see, e.g., [1, 2, 24, 25, 26].

As for the stable results investigated on the convergence of the sequence of mappings, there are some results for the vector optimization, vector variational inequality problems and vector equilibrium problems with a sequence of sets converging in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski (see e.g., [9, 10, 13, 16, 21]). In [13], Huang discussed the convergence of the approximate efficient sets to the efficient sets of vector-valued and set-valued optimization problems in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski and Mosco. In [10], Fang et al. investigated the Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the solution sets of the perturbed set-valued weak vector variational inequality problems. In [16], Lalitha and Chatterjee investigated the Painlevé-Kuratowski set convergence of the solution sets of a nonconvex vector optimization problem. In [21], Peng and Yang investigated the Painlevé-Kuratowski set convergence of the solution sets of the perturbed vector equilibrium problems without monotonicity in real linear metric spaces. Very recently, Li et al. [17] concerned with the stability for a generalized Ky Fan inequality when it is perturbed by vector-valued bifunction sequence and set sequence. By continuous convergence of the bifunction sequence and Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the set sequence, they established the Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the approximate solution mappings of a family of perturbed problems to the corresponding solution mapping of the original problem.

On the other hand, J.Y. Fu et al. in [11] presented a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with set-valued mapping and domination structure (GSVQEP). It is better than other solutions, such as weak efficient solution, efficient solution, and proper efficient solution. Therefore, it is interesting to discuss the (GSVQEP) and the properties of its solution set.

Motivated by the work reported in above, this paper aims to establish some results for the solution set of a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with set-valued mapping and domination structure. We first discuss the Painlevé-Kuratowski upper convergence of the solution sets. We consider a generalized nonlinear scalarization function, which will be used to construct a gap function for such problem on set-valued mapping concerning with set-valued mapping and domination structure and we also introduce a key assumption ( $H_g$ ). Thus, the Painlevé-Kuratowski lower convergence of the solution set is established under the main assumption ( $H_g$ ).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure (for short, GSVQEP) and (GSVQEP)<sub>n</sub>, recall some definitions and important properties. In section 3, we establish

Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the solution sets, and provide some examples to illustrate that our main results are new and different from the existing ones in literature.

## 2 วัตถุประสงค์ของโครงการวิจัย

- 2.1 To study the stability of the solution set for a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure (GSVQEP).
- 2.2 To study Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the solution sets with a sequence of mappings converging continuously and sequence of set converging in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski.

---

## 3 วิธีการดำเนินการวิจัย และ สถานที่ทำการทดลอง/เก็บข้อมูล

---

### 3.1 วิธีการดำเนินการวิจัย

- 3.1.1 Find books and publications about the stability of the solution set for a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure (GSVQEP).
- 3.1.2 Study the stability of the solution set for a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure (GSVQEP).
- 3.1.3 Introduce and analyze the Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the solution sets with a sequence of mappings converging continuously and sequence of set converging in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski.

3.2 สถานที่ทำการทดลอง/เก็บข้อมูล : Department of Mathematics, Faculty of science, Naresuan university

## 4 ระยะเวลาทำการวิจัย และแผนการดำเนินงานตลอดโครงการวิจัย

4.1 ระยะเวลาทำการวิจัย : 1 ปี

### 4.2 แผนการดำเนินงานตลอดโครงการวิจัย

- 1st Months

Study the stability of the solution set for a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure.

- 2nd-3rd Months

Investigate and analyze the sufficient conditions for the solution set for a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure.

- 4th-5th Months

Investigate and analyze the sufficient conditions for the solution set for a generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure (Cont.)

- 6th Months

Report the progress of the project to NU

- 7th-8th Months

We shall give the appropriate and sufficient conditions for the Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the solution sets with a sequence of mappings converging continuously and sequence of set converging in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski.

- 9th-11th Months

Prove the the Painlevé-Kuratowski convergence of the solution sets with a sequence of mappings converging continuously and sequence of set converging in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski.

- 12th Months

Write the paper and submit for publication in the ISI journal. Report the completed project to NU.

## 5 งบประมาณของโครงการวิจัย

รายละเอียดค่าใช้จ่าย	งบประมาณ
<b>1. หมวดค่าใช้สอย</b>	
1.1 ค่าตอบแทน ใช้สอยและวัสดุ	
1.1.1 ค่าตอบแทน	
1.1.1.1 ค่าตอบแทนผู้ช่วยวิจัยที่ไม่มีส่วนร่วมในผลงานวิจัย	108,000
1.1.1.2 ค่าตอบแทนการปฏิบัติงานนอกเวลาราชการ	10,000
1.1.1.3 ค่าตอบแทนนักวิจัย (10 %)	18,000
1.1.2 ค่าใช้สอย	
1.1.2.1 ค่าใช้จ่ายในการเดินทางไปราชการ	10,000
1.1.2.2 ค่าเช่ารถ	5,000
1.1.2.3 ค่าจ้างเหมาพิมพ์รายงาน	3,000
1.1.2.4 ค่าถ่ายเอกสาร	5,000
1.1.3 ค่าวัสดุ	
1.1.3.1 ค่าวัสดุสำนักงาน	15,000
1.1.3.2 ค่าวัสดุคอมพิวเตอร์	25,000
1.1.3.3 ค่าวัสดุหนังสือ วารสารและตำรา	17,500
1.2 ค่าสาธารณูปโภค	
1.2.1 ค่าโทรศัพท์	3,000
1.2.2 ค่าไปรษณีย์	500
<b>2. หมวดค่าวัสดุ</b>	
รวม	220,000

หมายเหตุ : ถัวเฉลี่ยทุกรายการ

## 6 ประโยชน์ที่คาดว่าจะได้รับ

- 6.1 ได้ค้นพบองค์ความรู้ใหม่ๆเกี่ยวกับความต่อเนื่องแบบไฮเตอร์ของการส่งผลเฉลยสำหรับอสมการอิงตัวแปรเสริม Ky Fan แบบอ่อน ผ่านการใช้สมบัติการเป็นคอนเวกซ์อย่างเข้ม
- 6.2 การนำไปประยุกต์ใช้แก้ไขปัญหาต่างๆ ทางคณิตศาสตร์ได้อย่างกว้างขวาง หรือใน แขนงวิชาอื่นๆ ที่เกี่ยวข้องอันเป็นผลมาจากการค้นพบองค์ความรู้ใหม่ในข้อ 1
- 6.3 มีผลงานตีพิมพ์ในระดับนานาชาติเพื่อเป็นการเผยแพร่ผลงานและชื่อเสียงของนัก คณิตศาสตร์ไทย
- 6.4 เกิดความร่วมมือและแลกเปลี่ยนทางวิชาการระหว่างนักคณิตศาสตร์ไทย และ นัก คณิตศาสตร์ต่างประเทศที่มีชื่อเสียงของโลก ซึ่งนำไปสู่การพัฒนาความเป็นเลิศทางวิชาการของวงการ คณิตศาสตร์ไทยและการพัฒนาประเทศชาติต่อไปในที่สุด

## 7 แผนการถ่ายทอดเทคโนโลยีหรือผลการวิจัยสู่กลุ่มเป้าหมาย

การเผยแพร่ผลงานทั้งในแง่ของการเข้าร่วมบรรยาย (oral presentation) ในการประชุมวิชาการทั้งในและต่างประเทศ รวมถึงส่งผลงานเพื่อพิจารณาตีพิมพ์ในวารสารระดับนานาชาติ เป็นผลให้ก่อให้เกิดการ

พัฒนาศึษาวิจัยอย่างต่อเนื่องทั้งในด้านของกลุ่มนักวิจัยในเชิงทฤษฎี และการต่อยอดเพื่อนำไปประยุกต์ใช้  
อย่างต่อเนื่องในแขนงวิชาอื่นๆ

#### 8 ผลสำเร็จและความคุ้มค่าของการวิจัยที่คาดว่าจะได้รับ

ประเภท	ผลงาน	จำนวน
การตีพิมพ์และ เผยแพร่	13.1 ตีพิมพ์ในวารสารระดับนานาชาติที่มีค่า Impact Factor	1 เรื่อง
	13.2 ตีพิมพ์ในวารสารระดับนานาชาติ (ไม่มีค่า Impact Factor)	.... เรื่อง
	13.3 ตีพิมพ์ในวารสารระดับประเทศ	.... เรื่อง
	13.4 นำเสนอในการประชุมวิชาการในระดับนานาชาติ ที่มีการตีพิมพ์บทความบน Proceedings	.... เรื่อง
	13.5 นำเสนอในการประชุมวิชาการในระดับชาติ ที่มีการตีพิมพ์บทความบน Proceedings	.... เรื่อง
	13.6 บทความวิชาการ ตำรา หนังสือที่มีการรับรองคุณภาพ	.... เรื่อง
การใช้ประโยชน์	13.7 ถ่ายทอดผลงานวิจัย / เทคโนโลยีสู่กลุ่มเป้าหมาย และ ได้รับการรับรองการใช้ประโยชน์จากหน่วยงานที่เกี่ยวข้อง	.... เรื่อง
	13.8 ได้สิ่งประดิษฐ์ อุปกรณ์ เครื่องมือ หรืออื่นๆ เช่น ฐานข้อมูล Software ที่สามารถนำไปใช้ประโยชน์ได้ต่อไป	.... เรื่อง
การจดทะเบียนทรัพย์สินทางปัญญา	13.9 อนุสิทธิบัตร	.... เรื่อง
	13.10 สิทธิบัตร	.... เรื่อง

## 9 เอกสารอ้างอิงของโครงการวิจัย

- 1 L.Q. Anh, P.Q. Khanh : Semicontinuity of the solution set of parametric multivalued vector quasiequilibrium problems, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 294: 699-711(2004).
- 2 L.Q. Anh, P.Q. Khanh : Continuity of solution maps of parametric quasiequilibrium problems, *Journal of Global Optimization*, 46, 247-259 (2010).
- 3 J.P. Aubin, I. Ekeland, *Applied Nonlinear Analysis*, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1984).
- 4 E. Blum, W. Oettli, From optimization and variational inequalities to equilibrium problems, *The Mathematics Student* 63. 123-145 (1994).
- ~~5 G.R. Chen, S.J. Li, Z.M. Fang, On the solution semicontinuity to a parametric generalized vector quasivariational inequality, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications* 60, 2417-2425 (2010).~~
- 6 G.Y. Chen, X.Q. Yang, H. Yu, A nonlinear scalarization function and generalized quasi-vector equilibrium problems, *J. Global Optim.* 32, 451-466 (2005).
- 7 G.Y. Chen, X.X. Huang, X.Q. Yang, *Vector Optimization: Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, (2005).
- 8 K. Fan, A minimax inequality and applications, *Inequalities, III* (Proc. Third Sympos., Univ. California, Los Angeles, Calif., 1969; dedicated to the memory of Theodore S. Motzkin), Academic Press, New York, pp. 103-113 (1972).
- 9 Z.M. Fang, S.J. Li, Painlevé-Kuratowski convergences of the solution sets for perturbed generalized systems, *Acta Math. Appl. Sin. Engl. Ser.* 28 , 361-370 (2012).
- 10 Z.M. Fang, S.J. Li, K.L. Teo, Painlevé-Kuratowski convergences for the solution sets of set-valued weak vector variational inequalities, *J. Inequal. Appl.* ID 43519 , 1-14 (2008).
- 11 J. Fu, S. Wang, Generalized strong vector quasi-equilibrium problem with domination structure, *J Glob Optim.* DOI 10.1007/s10898-012-9889-0.55, 839-847 (2013).
- 12 N.V. Hung, Stability of a solution set for parametric generalized vector mixed quasivariational inequality problem. *Journal of Inequalities and Applications.* (2013)
- 13 X.X. Huang, Stability in vector-valued and set-valued optimization, *Math. Methods Oper. Res.* 52, 185-195 (2000).
- 14 S.A. Khan, J.W. Chen, Gap Functions and Error Bounds for Generalized Mixed Vector Equilibrium Problems, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* DOI 10.1007/s10957-014-0683-7, (2014)
- 15 B.T. Kien, On the lower semicontinuity of optimal solution sets. *Optimization*, 54, 123-130, (2005).
- 16 C.S. Lalitha, P. Chatterjee, Stability and scalarization in vector optimization using improvement sets, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* , online first (2014).
- 17 X.B. Li, Z. Lin, Q.L. Wang, Stability of approximate solution mappings for generalized Ky Fan inequality, Springer. DOI 10.1007/s11750-015-0385-9 (2015).
- 18 G. Mastroeni, Gap Functions for Equilibrium Problems, *Journal of Global Optimization*, 411-426 (2003).

- 19 S.J. Li, K.L. Teo, X.Q. Yang, S.Y. Wu, Gap Functions and Existence of Solutions to Generalized Vector Quasi-Equilibrium Problems. *Journal of Global Optimization*, DOI 10.1007/s10898-005-2193-5, 427-440 (2006).
- 20 H. Nikaidó, K. Isoda, *Note on Noncooperative Convex Games*, Tokyo, Japan.
- 21 Z.Y. Peng, X.M. Yang, Painlevé-Kuratowski convergences of the solution sets for perturbed vector equilibrium problems without monotonicity, *Acta Math. Appl. Sin. Engl. Ser.* 30 , 845-858 (2014).
- 22 R.T. Rockafella, R.J.-B. Wets, *Variational analysis*, Springer, Berlin (1998).
- 23 V.M. Tam, H.T.K. Loan, Painlevé-Kuratowski upper convergence of the solution sets for vector quasi-equilibrium problems.(2015)
- ~~24 R. Wangkeeree, P. Boonman, P. Prechasilp : Lower semicontinuity of approximate solution mappings for parametric generalized vector equilibrium problems, *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2014-421 (2014).~~
- 25 R. Wangkeeree, R. Wangkeeree, P. Preechasilp : Continuity of the solution mappings to parametric generalized vector equilibrium problems, *Applied Mathematics Letters* 29 42-45 (2014).
- 26 R. Wangkeeree, T. Bantaojai, P. Yimmuang : Well-posedness for lexicographic vector quasiequilibrium problems with lexicographic equilibrium constraints, *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2015:163 (2015).
- 27 J. Zhao, The Lower Semicontinuity of Optimal Solution Sets, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 240-254 (1997).
- 28 Gerstewitz (Tammer) Chr.: Nichtkonvexe dualitat in der vektaroptimierung. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift T H Leuna-mersebung.* 25, 357-364 (1983)

## บทคัดย่อ


ในงานวิจัยนี้เราจะพิจารณาสมการ Ky Fan ที่เป็นเวกเตอร์อิงตัวแปรเสริมแบบพื้นฐานและแบบคู่ในปริภูมิเชิงเส้นเมตริก การใช้ความนูนแบบเข้มและความต่อเนื่องของ Holder สำหรับการส่งค่าเวกเตอร์โดยไม่ต้องไม่ต้องกำหนดความฟังก์ชันทางเดียวอย่างเข้มเราจะสร้างเงื่อนไขที่เพียงพอสำหรับการหาผลเฉลยเพื่อแก้ปัญหาเหล่านี้ให้เป็นความต่อเนื่องของ Holder รอบจุดอ้างอิงเมื่อการแก้ปัญหาเหล่านี้ไม่ได้มีเพียงคำตอบเดียวและมีตัวอย่างหลายตัวอย่างเพื่อแสดงให้เห็นว่าสมมติฐานที่กำหนดไว้มีความสำคัญและผลงานของเรามีความแตกต่างจากในวารสารวิจัยอื่นๆ






## Abstract

In this paper we consider primal and dual parametric vector Ky Fan inequality in metric linear spaces. Using the strong convexity and Holder continuity for vector valued mappings, without strong monotonicity assumption, we establish the sufficient conditions for the solution mappings to these problems to be Holder continuous around the reference point, when the solution of these problems is not unique. Many examples are provided to illustrate that the imposed assumptions are essential and our results are different from the existed ones in the literature.



## LIST OF CONTENT

Chapter	Page
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 PRELIMINARIES.....	4
<del>3 MAIN RESULTS.....</del>	<del>9</del>
4 CONCLUSION.....	28
REFERENCES.....	30
APPENDIX.....	33



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The Ky Fan inequality has been intensively studied in [1], where the author proposed the existence of a solution for a class of bifunctions. The mathematical formulation of this problem includes various important problems related to optimization, namely, optimization problems, variational inequality, Nash equilibrium problems, fixed-point and coincidence-point problems, etc. It is known that the general form of this problem was investigated earlier by Nikaido and Isoda [2] in 1955. At that time, this problem was carried out as an auxiliary problem to study the existence conditions for Nash equilibrium points in non-cooperative games. In the existence theory of the problem, the key contributions were made by Ky Fan, whose new existence results contained the original techniques which became a basis for most further existence theorems [1]. Hence, this model was also called a Ky Fan inequality.

The Ky Fan inequality has been extended and generalized to vector-valued mappings. This formulation is also known as the generalized Ky Fan inequality. In the literature, existence results for Ky Fan inequalities and the various types of generalized Ky Fan inequalities have been investigated intensively; see [3, 4, 6] and the references therein, where the generalized Ky Fan inequalities are called generalized systems or vector equilibrium problems.


It is well known that stability and sensitivity analysis of solution mappings for (generalized) Ky Fan inequalities is an important topic for (vector) optimization theory and its applications. There have been a large number of contributions to kinds of semicontinuity, continuity and Hölder continuity of solutions with respect to parameters. Anh and Khanh [7] introduced some definitions related to semicontinuity of multivalued mappings and discussed various kinds

of semicontinuity. They studied the sufficient conditions for the solution sets of parametric multivalued symmetric vector quasiequilibrium problems to have these properties. Huang et al. [8] further considered a class of parametric implicit vector equilibrium problems in Hausdorff topological vector spaces. They established sufficient conditions for the upper semicontinuity and lower semicontinuity of the solution set mapping. Furthermore, the continuity (or Hausdorff continuity) of solution maps was studied in [10, 9]. Kimura and Yao [10] investigated the existence of solutions and continuity of for the parametric vector quasi-equilibrium problem. Anh and Khanh [9] considered a parametric vector quasiequilibrium problem in topological vector spaces and given some sufficient conditions for solution maps to be lower and Hausdorff lower semicontinuous, upper semicontinuous and continuous. Using scalarization approaches, Chen and Li [11] obtained new results on the lower semicontinuity and upper semicontinuity properties of the Pareto solutions to a parametric vector variational inequality with a polyhedral constraint set. For related results on this field one can also refer to [17, 16, 15, 14, 12, 13].

However, this continuity was obtained under assumptions related to strong monotonicity or strong pseudomonotonicity. Then the results have been extended to quasiequilibrium problems. The case of non-unique solutions was dealt with recently in Anh et al. [18], avoiding assumptions related to strong monotonicity, but Hölder continuity was obtained only for approximate solutions which are as close as we want to exact solutions. In [19], Anh et al. established the sufficient conditions for Hölder continuity of solution mappings of Ky Fan inequalities without using the strong monotonicity assumptions. The technique is based on strong convexity and strong convex-likeness. In [20], Li and Li established the Hölder continuity of a set-valued solution mapping to a parametric weak generalized Fan Ky inequality. It is worth pointing that their method is based on a scalarization representation of the solution mapping for a

parametric Ky Fan inequality and the Hölder strong monotonicity assumptions. To the best of our knowledge, there is no existing result on Hölder continuity of primal and dual Ky Fan inequalities for the generalized Ky Fan inequalities without the virtue of Hölder strong monotonicity assumptions.

In this paper, we will first present the new concepts of the strong convexity and Hölder continuity for vector-valued mappings. Further, without the ~~virtue of strong monotonicity assumptions, we next establish also certain sufficient~~ conditions for Hölder continuity of both solution maps of parametric primal and dual weak generalized Ky Fan inequalities, when the solution set may not be singleton. Our technique is based on the strong convexity for vector-valued maps. Examples are provided for cases where our results are applicable while existing ones under the Hölder strong monotonicity assumptions are out of use.



## CHAPTER 2

### PRELIMINARIES

In the sequel,  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  denote the norm and metric in any normed space and metric space, respectively (by the context, no confusion occurs).  $B(0, \delta)$  is the closed ball with center  $0 \in X$  and radius  $\delta \geq 0$ . We use  $\text{int}A, \text{conv}(A)$ , and  $\text{diam}A := \sup_{x, z \in A} d(x, z)$  for the interior, the convex hull, and the diameter, respectively, of a subset  $A$ . For a set-valued map  $G : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ ,  $\text{gr}G := \{(x, y) \in X \times Y : y \in G(x)\}$  is the graph of  $G$ . Recall that  $X$  is called a metric linear space iff it is both a metric space and a linear space and the metric  $d$  of  $X$  is translation invariant (i.e.,  $d(x + z, y + z) = d(x, y), \forall x, y, z \in X$ ) and, for any convergent sequences  $\{\lambda_m\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\{x^m\}$  in  $X$ , we have  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_m x^m) = (\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_m)(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x^m)$ .

Throughout this paper, if not otherwise specified,  $X$  will denote a metric linear space,  $\Lambda$  and  $M$  two metric spaces, and  $Y$  a normed space. Let  $Y^*$  be the topological dual space of  $Y$ . For any  $\zeta \in Y^*$ , the norm of  $\zeta$  is defined by

$$\|\zeta\| := \sup\{\langle \zeta, x \rangle : \|x\| = 1\},$$

where  $\langle \zeta, x \rangle$  denotes the value of  $\zeta$  at  $x$ . Let  $C \subset Y$  be a pointed, closed and convex cone with  $\text{int}C \neq \emptyset$  and  $C^* := \{\zeta \in Y^* : \langle \zeta, x \rangle \geq 0, \forall x \in C\}$  be the dual cone of  $C$ . Since  $\text{int}C \neq \emptyset$ , the dual cone  $C^*$  of  $C$  has a weak\* compact base. For any given point  $e \in \text{int}C$ ,  $B_e^* := \{\zeta \in C^* : \langle \zeta, e \rangle = 1\}$  is a weak\* compact base of  $C^*$ . We first recall some notions needed in the sequel.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $(E, d)$  be a metric space. For  $A, B \subseteq E$ , the Hausdorff distance between  $A$  and  $B$  is defined by

$$H(A, B) = \max\{H^*(A, B), H^*(B, A)\},$$

where  $H^*(A, B) = \sup_{a \in A} d(a, B)$  and  $d(x, A) = \inf_{y \in A} d(x, y)$ .

Note that  $H(.,.)$  may not be a metric in the space of the subsets of  $E$ , since it can take the value  $\infty$ , and  $H$  is a metric in the space  $CB(E)$ , the collection of all nonempty, closed and bounded subsets of  $E$ .

Now we recall and introduce some concepts related to Hölder continuity for vector valued mappings.

**Definition 2.2 (Hölder continuity).** Let  $X, Y, M$  and  $C$  be given as above, and  $l, \alpha$  be given positive numbers.

1. (classical) A mapping  $g : X \rightarrow Y$ , is called  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous around  $\bar{x} \in X$  iff there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that, for all  $x_1, x_2 \in U$ ,

$$d(g(x_1), g(x_2)) \leq l d^\alpha(x_1, x_2).$$

2. (classical) A set-valued mapping  $G : X \rightarrow 2^Y$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous around  $\bar{x}$  iff there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that for any  $x_1, x_2 \in U$ ,

$$G(x_1) \subset G(x_2) + l d^\alpha(x_1, x_2).$$

3. (see [20]) A vector-valued mapping  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  is said to be  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e \in \text{int}C$  around  $\bar{x}$  iff, there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that for any  $x_1, x_2 \in U$ ,

$$g(x_1) \in g(x_2) + l d^\alpha(x_1, x_2)[-e, e],$$

where  $[-e, e] := (e - C) \cap (-e + C)$ .

4. For  $\theta \geq 0$ , a given mapping  $f, f : X \times X \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is called  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e \in \text{int}C$  around  $\bar{\mu} \in M$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $A \subseteq X$  iff, there is a neighborhood  $N$  of  $\bar{\mu}$  such that, for all  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in N$  and  $x, y \in A : x \neq y$ ,

$$f(x, y, \mu_1) \in f(x, y, \mu_2) + l d^\alpha(\mu_1, \mu_2) d^\theta(x, y)[-e, e].$$

If the degree of Hölder continuity is equal to 1, then Hölder continuity is called Lipschitz continuity. If a certain property is true at every point of  $B \subseteq X$ , we will said that it is satisfied in  $B$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Monotonicity for vector valued mapping). Let  $X, Y, C$  be as in Definition 2.2,  $g : X \times X \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping, and  $h, \beta$  be positive numbers

1. ([21])  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -Hölder strongly monotone on  $A \subseteq X$  iff for each  $x, y \in A : x \neq y$ ,

$$g(x, y) + g(y, x) + hd^\beta(x, y)B(0, 1) \subseteq -C.$$

2. ([20])  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -Hölder strongly monotone with respect to  $e \in \text{int } C$  on  $A \subseteq X$  iff for each  $x, y \in A : x \neq y$ ,

$$g(x, y) + g(y, x) + hd^\beta(x, y)e \in -C.$$

3. (classical)  $g$  is said to be monotone on  $A \subseteq X$  iff for each  $x, y \in A$ ,

$$g(x, y) + g(y, x) \in -C.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** [23, Lemma 3.21] *If  $Y$  is a real topological linear space and  $C$  is a convex cone with  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ , then*

$$\text{int } C = \left\{ y \in Y : \langle \zeta, y \rangle > 0, \forall \zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\} \right\}.$$

Now, we give the topological version of the separation theorem which is also known as Eidelheit's separation theorem.

**Lemma 2.5.** [24] *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be nonempty convex subsets of a real topological linear space  $X$  with  $\text{int } S \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\text{int } S \cap T \neq \emptyset$  if and only if there are a continuous linear functional  $l \in X^* \setminus \{0_{X^*}\}$  and a real number  $\alpha$  with*

$$l(s) \leq \alpha \leq l(t), \text{ for all } s \in S \text{ and } t \in T$$



and

$$l(s) < \alpha, \text{ for all } s \in \text{int } S.$$

Now, we introduce new definitions of the strong convexity and convexity-likeness for the vector valued mappings which are need in this paper.

**Definition 2.6 (Strong convexity).** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric linear space,  $Y$  a normed space. Let  $A \subset X$  be a convex subset of  $X$ ,  $C \subset Y$  a convex cone with  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping.  $g$  is said to be  $C$ -strongly convex with modulus  $h$  and  $\beta$  on  $A$  iff there exists two positive real number  $h$  and  $\beta$  and a point  $e \in \text{int } C$  such that for all  $x, y \in A$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$tg(x) + (1-t)g(y) - ht(1-t)d^\beta(x, y)e \in g(tx + (1-t)y) + C. \quad (2.1)$$

In this case  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex with respect to  $e$ .

**Remark 2.7.** (i) A mapping  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  is called  $C$ -convex if for all  $x, y \in A$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$tg(x) + (1-t)g(y) \in g(tx + (1-t)y) + C.$$

Clearly, every  $C$ -strongly convex function is  $C$ -convex. However, the converse is not true. For example, if  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}$  and  $g$  is defined by  $g(x) = x^4$ . It is clear that  $g$  is  $C$ -convex but it is not  $C$ -strongly convex as there is no  $h > 0$  that satisfies (2.1).

(ii) If  $Y = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}$  in the above definition, then  $g$  is called  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -strongly convex on  $A$  (see Definition 2.2 [18] and Definition 2.1 [5]).

(iii) The examples of  $C$ -strongly convex vector valued functions can be found in Example 3.4 and Example 3.6.

**Definition 2.8 (Strong convex-likeness).** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric linear space,  $Y$  a normed space. Let  $B \subset X$  be a nonempty subset of  $X$ ,  $C \subset Y$  a convex cone with  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping.


1.  $g$  is said to be *C-convex-like* in  $B$  iff for all  $x_1, x_2 \in B$ , and  $t \in [0, 1]$ , there is  $z \in B$

$$g(z) \in tg(x_1) + (1 - t)g(x_2) - C.$$

2.  $g$  is said to be *C-strongly convex-like with respect to  $e$*  in  $B$  iff there are two positive real numbers  $h$  and  $\beta$  and a point  $e \in \text{int } C$  such that for all  $x_1, x_2 \in B$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$  there is  $z \in B$ ,

$$g(z) + ht(1 - t)d^\beta(x_1, x_2)e \in tg(x_1) + (1 - t)g(x_2) - C.$$

As usual  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -*C-strongly concave* (*C-concave-like*, resp.) on  $A$  if  $-g$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -*C-strongly convex* (*C-convex-like*, resp.) on  $A$ .



## CHAPTER 3

### MAIN RESULTS

#### 3.1 Hölder continuity of solution maps of parametric primal-Ky Fan inequalities

Let  $X, Y, \Lambda, M, C$  and  $e$  be as in Section 2, and let  $K : \Lambda \rightarrow 2^X$  be a set-valued mapping with nonempty convex values and  $f : X \times X \times M \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping. For each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $\mu \in M$ , we consider the following parametric weak generalized Ky Fan inequality (for short, (GKF)) :

$$(GKF) \begin{cases} \text{Find } x_0 \in K(\lambda) \text{ such that} \\ f(x_0, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int } C, \forall y \in K(\lambda). \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

For each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , we denote the solution set of by

$$S(\lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : f(x, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int } C, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

For each  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $\mu \in M$ , the  $\xi$ -solution set of the (GKF) is denoted by

$$S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : \langle \xi, f(x, y, \mu) \rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

In this section, we consider Hölder continuity of solution mappings of (GKF). Since existence conditions of solutions have been studied much in the literature, we do not include existence investigations and always assume that  $S(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty for the considered point  $(\lambda, \mu)$ . Firstly, by using the idea given in [28], we establish the relationships between the solution sets and the  $\xi$ -solution sets under new mild conditions imposed on the vector valued mappings.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If for each  $x \in K(\Lambda)$  and  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $C$ -convex-like in  $K(\lambda)$ , then*

$$S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_{\xi}(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in B_C^*} S_{\xi}(\lambda, \mu).$$

*Proof.* (a) We first prove that

$$S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_{\xi}(\lambda, \mu).$$

Let  $x \in \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_{\xi}(\lambda, \mu)$  be arbitrary given. Then, there exists  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $x \in S_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda, \mu)$ . By the definition of  $S_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda, \mu)$ , for each  $y \in K(\lambda)$ ,

$$\langle \bar{\xi}, f(x, y, \mu) \rangle \geq 0.$$

Applying Lemma 2.4, we can see that, for all  $y \in K(\lambda)$ ,  $f(x, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int}C$ . This shows that  $x \in S(\lambda, \mu)$ . Hence, we have that

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_{\xi}(\lambda, \mu) \subseteq S(\lambda, \mu).$$

Conversely, let  $x \in S(\lambda, \mu)$  be arbitrary given. Then, we have that  $f(x, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int}C$  for all  $y \in K(\lambda)$ . Obviously, we have

$$f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) \cap (-\text{int}C) = \emptyset. \quad (3.2)$$

Next, we prove that

$$(f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C) \cap (-\text{int}C) = \emptyset.$$

Suppose on the contrary that, there exists  $w \in (f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C) \cap (-\text{int}C)$ . Hence, there exist  $z \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu)$  and  $c \in C$  such that  $w = z + c \in -\text{int}C$ . So, one has  $z = -c - w \in -\text{int}C$ , which is a contradiction with (3.2). Now, we will show that  $f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C$  is a convex subset of  $Y$ . To this end, let  $z_1, z_2 \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$  be arbitrary given. Then, there are  $y_1, y_2 \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in C$  such that

$$z_i = f(x, y_i, \mu) + c_i, \text{ for all } i = 1, 2.$$

Then, the convex-likeness of the mapping  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  in  $K(\lambda)$  implies that there exist  $s \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c \in C$  such that

$$tf(x, y_1, \mu) + (1-t)f(x, y_2, \mu) = f(x, s, \mu) + c.$$

Since  $C$  is a convex cone, we have

$$\begin{aligned} tz_1 + (1-t)z_2 &= tf(x, y_1, \mu) + tc_1 + (1-t)f(x, y_2, \mu) + (1-t)c_2 \\ &= f(x, s, \mu) + [c + tc_1 + (1-t)c_2] \\ &\in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that  $f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C$  is convex. Applying Lemma 2.5, there exist a continuous linear functional  $\zeta \in Y^* \setminus \{0\}$  and a number  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\langle \zeta, \bar{c} \rangle < \gamma < \langle \zeta, z + c \rangle, \forall \bar{c} \in -\text{int}C, \forall z \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu), \forall c \in C.$$

Since  $C$  is a cone, we imply that, for all  $\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$  and  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\alpha\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$ . So,  $\langle \zeta, \bar{c} \rangle \leq 0$  for all  $\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$ . Moreover,  $\zeta$  is a continuous linear function, one yields  $\langle \zeta, c \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $c \in C$ , i.e.,  $\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$  can be chosen arbitrarily close to 0, we imply that  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Similarly, since  $c \in C$  also can be taken arbitrarily close to 0 and  $\zeta$  is a continuous linear function, we derive that  $\langle \zeta, z \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $z \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu)$ , i.e.,

$$\langle \zeta, f(x, y, \mu) \rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda),$$

and hence  $x \in S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu)$ . So,  $S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu)$ .

(b) Next we show that

$$\bigcup_{\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\zeta \in B_e^*} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu).$$

Since  $B_e^* \subset (C^* \setminus \{0\})$ , one has  $\bigcup_{\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu) \supset \bigcup_{\zeta \in B_e^*} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu)$ . Conversely, for each  $\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ , from Lemma 2.4 we have  $\langle \zeta, e \rangle > 0$  as  $e \in \text{int}C$ . Putting  $\bar{\zeta} = \frac{1}{\langle \zeta, e \rangle} \zeta$ , then  $\bar{\zeta} \in B_e^*$  and  $S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu) = S_{\bar{\zeta}}(\lambda, \mu)$ , for all  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , and hence  $S_\zeta \subset \bigcup_{\zeta \in B_e^*} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu)$ , for all  $\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ . So,  $\bigcup_{\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu) \subset \bigcup_{\zeta \in B_e^*} S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu)$ .

□

*Remark 3.2.* Compared with the results (Lemma 3.1) obtained in [28],  $C$ -convexity of  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  in  $K(\lambda)$  is weakened by  $C$ -convex-likeness of  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  in  $K(\lambda)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that for each  $\xi \in B_e^*$ ,  $S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume the following :*

1.  $K$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous in a neighborhood  $N(\lambda_0)$  of  $\lambda_0$ ;
2. there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K(N(\lambda_0))$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N(\lambda_0)))$ ;
3. for each  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone in  $K(N(\lambda_0)) \times K(N(\lambda_0))$ ;
4.  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K(N(\lambda_0))$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S$  is single-valued and satisfies the following Hölder condition:

$$H(S(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.3)$$

for each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ .

*Proof.* (a) We first prove that, for each  $\bar{\xi} \in B_e^*$  there are neighborhoods  $N(\bar{\xi})$ ,  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$  such that for each  $\xi \in N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0) \times N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$ ,

$$\rho(S_\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\rho(A, B) := \sup\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$  for each  $A, B \subset Y$ .

The proof of (3.4) is separated into three steps:

Step I: For any given two points  $x_{11} \in S_{\zeta}(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_{\zeta}(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we claim that

$$d_1 := d(x_{11}, x_{21}) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

From the definition of  $S_{\zeta}$ , we have that, for all  $y \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $z \in K(\lambda_2)$ ,

$$\min \left\{ \langle \zeta, f(x_{11}, y, \mu_1) \rangle, \langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, z, \mu_1) \rangle \right\} \geq 0. \quad (3.5)$$

~~It follows from the  $(l-\alpha)$ -Hölder continuity of  $K$  imposed in (i), there are  $x_1 \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $x_2 \in K(\lambda_2)$  satisfying~~

$$\max \left\{ d(x_{11}, x_2), d(x_{21}, x_1) \right\} \leq ld^{\alpha}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2). \quad (3.6)$$

Taking  $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21})$ , it is clear that  $\bar{x} \in \text{conv}(K(N(\lambda_0)))$ . Since  $f(x_{11}, \cdot, \mu_1)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strong convexity with respect to  $e$ , we have that

$$f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta}e \in -C.$$

Then, it follows from the definition of  $B_e^*$  that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta}e \right\rangle \\ &= \langle \zeta, f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) \rangle - \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \\ &\quad - \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \zeta, \frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta}e \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which arrives that

$$\frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta} \leq \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \langle \zeta, f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) \rangle. \quad (3.7)$$

Since  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  is monotone and  $x_{11} \in S_{\zeta}(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ , we have

$$\left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\left\langle \zeta, f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \leq -\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle. \quad (3.9)$$

Using (3.7),(3.8) and (3.9), we imply that

$$\frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta \leq -\left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle. \quad (3.10)$$

Taking  $z = x_2$  and  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1)$  in (3.5), we can get that

$$\min \left\{ \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), \mu_1\right) \right\rangle, \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \right\rangle \right\} \geq 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Hence, (3.10) and (3.11) together yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq -\left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_1}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle + \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_1}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left| \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_1}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (3.6) and the  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_{11}, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $f(x_{21}, \cdot, \mu_1)$  given in (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq \frac{1}{2}md(x_{11}, x_2) + \frac{1}{2}md(x_{21}, x_1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \frac{1}{2}mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \\ &\leq mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2), \end{aligned}$$

which gives that

$$d_1 \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Step II: We claim that for any given two points  $x_{21} \in S_\zeta(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{22} \in S_\zeta(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ ,

$$d_2 := d(x_{21}, x_{22}) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

By the definition of  $\zeta$ -solutions, we have that, for all  $y, z \in K(\lambda_2)$ ,

$$\min \left\{ \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, y, \mu_1) \right\rangle, \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{22}, z, \mu_2) \right\rangle \right\} \geq 0. \quad (3.12)$$



Putting  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22})$  in (3.12), it is clear that  $y \in K(\lambda_2)$ , and hence

$$\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, y, \mu_1) \rangle \geq 0.$$

By virtue of the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -C-strong convexity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_{21}, \cdot, \mu_1)$ , one has

$$f\left(x_{21}, \frac{x_{21} + x_{22}}{2}, \mu_1\right) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta e \in -C.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{21}, \frac{x_{21} + x_{22}}{2}, \mu_1\right) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta e \right\rangle \\ &\geq \left\langle \xi, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta e \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , one yields

$$\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle - \frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \geq 0. \quad (3.13)$$

By the monotonicity of  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we obtain

$$\xi(f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1)) = 0 \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle. \quad (3.15)$$

From (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15), we imply that

$$\frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle. \quad (3.16)$$

Now, replacing  $z$  in (3.12) by  $\frac{1}{2}(x_{22} + x_{21})$ , we have

$$\left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{22}, \frac{x_{22} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_2\right) \right\rangle \geq 0. \quad (3.17)$$

By the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -C-strong convexity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_{22}, \cdot, \mu_2)$ , we obtain the following inequality which is similar to (3.13), concretely

$$\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \rangle - \frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \geq 0.$$

As  $\xi(f(x_{22}, x_{22}, \mu_2)) = 0$ ,

$$\frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \leq \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) \rangle. \quad (3.18)$$

Summing (3.16) and (3.18) and combining with assumption (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} hd_2^\beta &\leq \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) \rangle - \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle \\ &\leq |\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) - f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle| \\ &\leq nd^\gamma(\mu_1, \mu_2)d_2^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$d_2 \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Step III: Finally, applying Step I and Step II, for each  $x_{11} \in S_\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{22} \in S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ , we have

$$d(x_{11}, x_{22}) \leq d_1 + d_2 \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Hence, we get

$$\rho(S^\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S^\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.19)$$

(b) Now we prove (3.50). We see that  $B_e^*$  is a weak\* compact set and hence it can be covered by finitely many open sets, i.e.,

$$B_e^* \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n N(\xi_i), \quad (3.20)$$

where  $\xi_i \in B_e^*$  and  $N(\xi_i)$  is a neighborhood of  $\xi_i$ , defined in (a). For  $N_{\xi_i}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N_{\xi_i}(\mu_0)$  determined as in (a), let  $N'(\lambda_0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n N_{\xi_i}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n N_{\xi_i}(\mu_0)$ . For each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$  and  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , it follows from (3.20) that there exists  $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $\xi \in N(\xi_{i_0})$  and obviously,  $(\lambda, \mu) \in N_{\xi_{i_0}}(\lambda_0) \times N_{\xi_{i_0}}(\mu_0)$ . Combining the convexity of  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  assumed in (ii) with Lemma 3.2, we have

$$S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu).$$

For each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ , we now show that

$$H(S(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.21)$$

Indeed, for each  $x_{11} \in S(\lambda_1, \mu_1) = \cup_{\xi \in B_c^*} S_{\xi}(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ , there is  $\xi \in B_c^*$  such that  $x_{11} \in S_{\xi}(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ . As  $S_{\xi}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \subseteq S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$  and applying (a), one has

$$d(x_{11}, S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq d(x_{11}, S_{\xi}(\lambda_2, \mu_2))$$

$$\leq H^*(S_{\xi}(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_{\xi}(\lambda_2, \mu_2))$$

$$\leq \rho(S_{\xi}(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_{\xi}(\lambda_2, \mu_2)).$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Therefore,

$$H^*(S(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.22)$$

Similarly, we also have

$$H^*(S(\lambda_2, \mu_2), S(\lambda_1, \mu_1)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.23)$$

Combining (3.22) with (3.23), we obtain (3.50). Furthermore, setting  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$  and  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  in the inequality (3.50), we can see that the diameter of the solution set  $S(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  is 0 (for arbitrary  $(\lambda_1, \mu_2)$ ), i.e., the solution map  $S$  of (GKF) is single-valued in  $N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 3.3.* 1. Compared with the results obtained in [18], the real valued function  $f$  is generalized to the vector valued function. Further, the strong convexity for the real valued function is extended to C-strong convexity for the vector valued function.

2. Comparing Theorem 3.1 and the results obtained in [25, 26, 27, 29], we can see that the main difference is the assumption (ii), namely, we assume that

$f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N(\lambda_0)))$  in Theorem 3.1 but strong monotone in [25], or strong pseudomonotone in [26, 27] or  $f$  is satisfied a condition related to strong monotonicity in [29]. Hence, Theorem 3.1 can be applicable in the general case of non-unique solutions while the aforesaid results do not work as in the following example.

**Example 3.4.** Let  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2, \Lambda \equiv M = [0, 1], C = \mathbb{R}_+^2, e = (1, 1), K(\lambda) = [-1 - \lambda, 1 + \lambda], \bar{\lambda} = 0$ , and

$$f(x, y, \lambda) = ((\lambda + 1)(y_1^2 - x_1^2), (\lambda + 1)(y_2^2 - x_2^2)),$$

where  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ . It is not hard to see that all assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and  $S(\lambda) \equiv \{(0, 0)\}$  is Hölder continuous. However, we can see that

$$f((1, 1), (-1, -1), \lambda) = f((-1, -1), (1, 1), \lambda) = (0, 0), \text{ for all } \lambda \in M.$$

Hence the assumptions on strong monotonicity in [25], strong pseudo-monotonicity in [26, 27] and some conditions related to strong monotonicity in [29] are not satisfied. Thus, the main results given in [26, 27, 29] do not work while Theorem 3.1 can be applicable.

To illustrate the essential of imposed assumptions which do not relate to Hölder continuity in Theorem 3.1, we bring out some following examples.

**Example 3.5** (the strong convexity is essential). Let  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2, \Lambda \equiv M = [0, 1], C = \mathbb{R}_+^2, e = (1, 1), K(\lambda) = [\lambda, 1], \bar{\lambda} = 0$ , and  $f(x, y, \lambda) = (\lambda(x_1^2 - y_1^2), \lambda(x_2^2 - y_2^2))$ , where  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ . Then, all assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are fulfilled, except for the strong convexity of  $f$ . By direct calculations, we have

$$S(\lambda) = \begin{cases} [0, 1] \times [0, 1], & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \\ \{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

which is not lower semicontinuous at  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ .

**Example 3.6** (the monotonicity is crucial). Let  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\Lambda \equiv M = [0, 1]$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ ,  $e = (1, 1)$ ,  $K(\lambda) \equiv [0, 1]$ ,  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ , and  $f(x, y, \lambda) = (y_1^2 - \lambda x_1, y_2^2 - \lambda x_2)$ , where  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ .  $f(x, y, \lambda) = y^2 - \lambda x$ . Then, it is not hard to see that the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, except the monotonicity of  $f$  ( $f(x, y, 0) + f(y, x, 0) = (y_1^2 + x_1^2, y_2^2 + x_2^2) > 0$  assumed in the theorem, for many  $x, y \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ ). Direct computations give us the solution set

$$S(\lambda) = \begin{cases} [0, 1] \times [0, 1], & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \\ \{(0, 0)\}, & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

which is even not lower semicontinuous at  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ .

In the special case where  $K(\lambda) \equiv K$  ( $K$  is a nonempty set), the strong convexity in assumption (ii) of Theorem 3.1 can be reduced to the strong convex-likeness along with several other relaxations, and we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 3.2.** For (KF) with  $K(\lambda) \equiv K$ . Suppose that for each  $\xi \in B_e^*$ ,  $S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume the following :

1. there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -C-strongly convex-like with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}K$ ;
2. for each  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone in  $K \times K$ ;
3.  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S$  satisfies the following Hölder condition: For each  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in N'(\mu_0)$ ,

$$H(S(\mu_1), S(\mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.24)$$

*Proof.* (a) We first prove that, for each  $\bar{\xi} \in B_e^*$  there are neighborhoods  $N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$  such that for each  $\xi \in N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$ ,

$$\rho(S_{\xi}(\mu_1), S_{\xi}(\mu_2)) \leq + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2), \quad (3.25)$$

where  $\rho(A, B) := \sup\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$  for each  $A, B \subset Y$ .

Firstly, we claim that for any given two points  $x_1 \in S_{\xi}(\mu_1)$  and  $x_2 \in S_{\xi}(\mu_2)$ ,

$$d(x_1, x_2) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

By the definition of  $\xi$ -solutions, we have that, for all  $y, z \in K$ ,

$$\min \left\{ \langle \xi, f(x_1, y, \mu_1) \rangle, \langle \xi, f(x_2, z, \mu_2) \rangle \right\} \geq 0. \quad (3.26)$$

Putting  $y = x_2 \in K$  in (3.26), we have that

$$\langle \xi, f(x_1, y, \mu_1) \rangle \geq 0.$$

By virtue of the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -C-strong convex-likeness with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_2, \cdot, \mu_1)$ , we have that there is  $v \in K$  such that

$$f(x_1, v, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d^{\beta}(x_1, x_2)e \in -C.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left\langle \xi, f(x_1, v, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d^{\beta}(x_1, x_2)e \right\rangle \\ &\geq \left\langle \xi, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d^{\beta}(x_1, x_2)e \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , one yields

$$\langle \xi, f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle - \frac{h}{2}d^{\beta}(x_1, x_2) \geq 0. \quad (3.27)$$

By the monotonicity of  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_1 \in S_{\xi}(\mu_1)$ , we obtain

$$\xi(f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1)) = 0 \quad (3.28)$$

and

$$\langle \xi, f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) \rangle \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle. \quad (3.29)$$

From (3.27), (3.28) and (3.29), we have that

$$\frac{h}{2} d^\beta(x_1, x_2) \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle. \quad (3.30)$$

Now, replacing  $w$  in (3.26) by  $x_1$ , we have

$$\langle \xi, f(x_2, z, \mu_2) \rangle = \langle \xi, f(x_2, w, \mu_2) \rangle \geq 0. \quad (3.31)$$

By the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strong convex-likeness with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_2, \cdot, \mu_2)$ , we obtain the following inequality which is similar to (3.27), concretely

$$\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_2, \mu_2) \rangle - \frac{h}{2} d_2^\beta \geq 0.$$

As  $\xi(f(x_2, x_2, \mu_2)) = 0$ ,

$$\frac{h}{2} d_2^\beta \leq \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) \rangle. \quad (3.32)$$

Summing (3.30) and (3.32) and combining with assumption (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} h d_2^\beta &\leq \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) \rangle - \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle \\ &\leq |\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) - f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle| \\ &\leq n d^\gamma(\mu_1, \mu_2) d_2^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$d(x_1, x_2) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Hence, we get

$$\rho(S_\xi(\mu_1), S_\xi(\mu_2)) \leq + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.33)$$

(b) Proving (3.51) is similar to the proof of (3.51) in Theorem 3.1 and hence we can get our result.

□

### 3.2 Hölder continuity of solution maps of parametric dual Ky Fan inequalities

Let  $X, Y, \Lambda, M, C, e, K, f$  be as in Section 3. For each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , we consider the following parametric dual weak generalized Ky Fan inequality:

(DKF) Find  $x_0 \in K(\lambda)$ , such that

$$f(y, x_0, \mu) \notin \text{int}C, \forall y \in K(\lambda). \quad (3.34)$$

As usual, for each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , the solution set of (DKF) is denoted by

$$S^d(\lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : f(y, x, \mu) \notin \text{int}C, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

For each  $\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\lambda \in N(\lambda_0)$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ , the  $\zeta$ -solution set of (DKF) is denoted by

$$S_\zeta^d(\zeta, \lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : \langle \zeta, f(y, x, \mu) \rangle \leq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

Note that we can not compare the solution sets of primal problems (KF) with that of the dual problems (DKF) in general (see, Example 2.1 in [19]). However, under some suitable assumptions we can get certain relationships between both of them (see [30]). In this section, we focuss on the Hölder continuity of solution mappings of (DKF) and always assume that all kinds of solution sets of the problems are nonempty in the neighborhood of the reference point. The following lemma plays an important role in the proof of our main result.

**Lemma 3.7.** *If for each  $x \in K(\Lambda)$  and  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ ,  $f(\cdot, x, \mu)$  is  $C$ -concave-like in  $K(\lambda)$ , then*

$$S^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\zeta^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\zeta \in B_C^*} S_\zeta^d(\lambda, \mu).$$

*Proof.* We first show that

$$S^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\zeta \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\zeta^d(\lambda, \mu).$$



Let  $x \in \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_{\xi}^d(\lambda, \mu)$ , there is  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $x \in S_{\bar{\xi}}^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . So,

$$\langle \bar{\xi}, f(y, x, \mu) \rangle \leq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda).$$

Combining above affirmation with Lemma 2.4, we imply that  $f(y, x, \mu) \notin \text{int}C$ , for all  $y \in K(\lambda)$ . Hence  $x \in S^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . Conversely, let  $x \in S^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . By the definition of (DKF), we have

$$f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) \cap (\text{int}C) = \emptyset,$$

and hence,

$$(f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C) \cap (\text{int}C) = \emptyset.$$

Let  $z_1, z_2 \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C$ , there are  $y_1, y_2 \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in C$  such that  $z_i = f(y_i, x, \mu) - c_i, i = 1, 2$ . Since  $f(\cdot, x, \mu)$  is concave-like in  $K(\lambda)$ , for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , there are  $s \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c \in C$  such that

$$tf(y_1, x, \mu) + (1-t)f(y_2, x, \mu) = f(s, x, \mu) - c,$$

i.e.,  $tz_1 + (1-t)z_2 = f(s, x, \mu) - tc_1 - (1-t)c_2 - c \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C$ , and hence  $f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C$  is a convex subset of  $Y$ . By the virtue of Lemma 2.5, we obtain a continuous linear functional  $\xi \in Y^* \setminus \{0\}$  and a number  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\langle \xi, z - c \rangle < \gamma < \langle \xi, \bar{c} \rangle, \forall z \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu), \forall c \in C, \forall \bar{c} \in \text{int}C.$$

Since  $C$  is a cone, we have  $\langle \xi, \bar{c} \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $\bar{c} \in \text{int}C$ , and hence we also have  $\langle \xi, c \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $c \in C$ , i.e.,  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $\bar{c} \in \text{int}C$  and  $c \in C$  can chosen arbitrarily close to 0, we yield  $\gamma \geq 0$  and  $\langle \xi, z \rangle \leq 0$  for all  $z \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu)$ , and hence  $x \in S_{\xi}^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . So,  $S^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_{\xi}^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . Using the given arguments as in Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_{\xi}^d(\lambda, \mu) \subset \bigcup_{\xi \in B_{\bar{c}}^*} S_{\xi}^d(\lambda, \mu).$$

□

Applying Lemma 3.7, we establish sufficient conditions for the solution mappings of (DKF) to be Hölder continuous.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Suppose that for each  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , the  $\xi$ -solution set  $S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu)$  exists in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume that the following assumptions are satisfied:*

1.  ~~$K$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous in a neighborhood  $N(\lambda_0)$  of  $\lambda_0$ ,~~
2. there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K(N(\lambda_0))$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, x, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly concave with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N))$ ;
3. for each  $\mu \in U(\mu_0)$ ,  $-f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone on  $K(N(\lambda_0)) \times K(N(\lambda_0))$ ;
4.  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K(N(\lambda_0))$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S^d$  is single-valued and satisfies the following Hölder condition: for each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ ,

$$H(S^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S^d(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.35)$$

*Proof.* We first show that, for each  $\bar{\xi} \in B_e^*$  there are neighborhoods  $N(\bar{\xi})$ ,  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$  such that for each  $\xi \in N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0) \times N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$

$$\rho(S_\xi^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_\xi^d(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.36)$$

To this end, the proof of (3.36) is divided into three steps:

Step I: For any given two points  $x_{11} \in S_\xi^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_\xi^d(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we claim that

$$d_1 := d(x_{11}, x_{21}) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$



By the construction of  $S_{\xi}^d$ , for all  $y \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $z \in K(\lambda_2)$ , we have

$$\max \left\{ \langle \xi, f(y, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle, \langle \xi, f(z, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle \right\} \leq 0. \quad (3.37)$$

Thanks to (i), there are  $x_1 \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $x_2 \in K(\lambda_2)$  such that

$$\max \left\{ d(x_{11}, x_2), d(x_{21}, x_1) \right\} \leq ld^{\alpha}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2). \quad (3.38)$$

Putting  $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21})$ , it follows from the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -C-strongly concavity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(\cdot, x_{11}, \mu_1)$  that

$$-f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta}e \in -C.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta}e \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \\ &\quad + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta}e \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which arrives that

$$\frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta} \leq -\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle. \quad (3.39)$$

On the other hand, combining the monotonicity of  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{11} \in S_{\xi}^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ , one has

$$\langle \xi, f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle = 0 \quad (3.40)$$

and

$$\langle \xi, f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle \geq -\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle. \quad (3.41)$$

Combining (3.39), (3.40) and (3.41), one gets

$$\frac{h}{4}d_1^{\beta} \leq -\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle. \quad (3.42)$$

Now, setting  $z = x_2$  and  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1)$  in (3.37), we have

$$\min \left\{ -\left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle, -\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle \right\} \geq 0. \quad (3.43)$$

Hence, from (3.42) and (3.43), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21}), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\
&\quad - \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21}), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\
&\leq \left| \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21}), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

By (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq \frac{1}{2}md(x_{21}, x_1) + \frac{1}{2}md(x_{11}, x_2) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}md^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \frac{1}{2}md^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \\
&= mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$d_1 \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Step II : Next we prove that for any given points  $x_{21} \in S_\xi^d(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{22} \in S_\xi^d(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ ,

$$d_2 := d(x_{21}, x_{22}) \leq \left(\frac{m}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

By the definition of  $S_\xi^d$ , all  $y, z \in K(\lambda_2)$ , we get

$$\max \left\{ \left\langle \xi, f(y, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle, \left\langle \xi, f(z, x_{22}, \mu_2) \right\rangle \right\} \leq 0. \quad (3.44)$$

Substituting  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22})$  in (3.44), we obtain

$$\left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22}), x_{21}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \leq 0,$$

which implies that

$$-\left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22}), x_{21}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \geq 0.$$

By virtue of the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -C-strong concavity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(\cdot, x_{21}, \mu_1)$ , we get

$$-f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22}), x_{21}, \mu_1\right) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta e \in -C.$$

By virtue of the linearity of  $\zeta$  and above discussion, we imply that

$$\left\langle \zeta, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \zeta, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta \geq 0. \quad (3.45)$$

From the monotonicity of  $-f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_\zeta^d(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we have

$$\zeta(f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1)) = 0 \quad (3.46)$$

and

$$\left\langle \zeta, -f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \leq \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \right\rangle. \quad (3.47)$$

Hence, combining (3.45), (3.46) and (3.47), one has

$$\frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \leq \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \right\rangle. \quad (3.48)$$

Similarly, by setting  $z = \frac{1}{2}(x_{22} + x_{21})$  in (3.44), and using the above discussion, we also imply that

$$\frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \leq \left\langle \zeta, -f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \right\rangle = -\left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \right\rangle. \quad (3.49)$$

Summing (3.48) and (3.49) and combining with (iv), we establish

$$\begin{aligned} hd_2^\beta &\leq \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left| \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \zeta, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\leq nd^\gamma(\mu_1, \mu_2)d_2^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$d_2 \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2),$$

and thus, (3.36) is derived from the conclusions of Steps I and II. Finally, using the given the same argument in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can arrive the desired conclusion.  $\square$

## CHAPTER 4

### CONCLUSION

The following results are all results of this research:

1. Suppose that for each  $\zeta \in B_e^*$ ,  $S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume the following :
  - (a)  $K$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous in a neighborhood  $N(\lambda_0)$  of  $\lambda_0$ ;
  - (b) there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K(N(\lambda_0))$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N(\lambda_0)))$ ;
  - (c) for each  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone in  $K(N(\lambda_0)) \times K(N(\lambda_0))$ ;
  - (d)  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K(N(\lambda_0))$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S$  is single-valued and satisfies the following Hölder condition:

$$H(S(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.50)$$

for each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ .

2. For (KF) with  $K(\lambda) \equiv K$ . Suppose that for each  $\zeta \in B_e^*$ ,  $S_\zeta(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume the following :
  - (a) there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex-like with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}K$ ;

- (b) for each  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone in  $K \times K$ ;
- (c)  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S$  satisfies the following Hölder condition: For each  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in N'(\mu_0)$ ,

$$H(S(\mu_1), S(\mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.51)$$

3. Suppose that for each  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , the  $\xi$ -solution set  $S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu)$  exists in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume that the following assumptions are satisfied:
- (a)  $K$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous in a neighborhood  $N(\lambda_0)$  of  $\lambda_0$ ;
  - (b) there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K(N(\lambda_0))$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, x, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly concave with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N))$ ;
  - (c) for each  $\mu \in U(\mu_0)$ ,  $-f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone on  $K(N(\lambda_0)) \times K(N(\lambda_0))$ ;
  - (d)  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K(N(\lambda_0))$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S^d$  is single-valued and satisfies the following Hölder condition: for each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ ,

$$H(S^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S^d(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \quad (3.52)$$

## References

- [1] K. Fan, *A minimax inequality and applications*. In: Shisha O (ed) *Inequality III* Academic Press, New York. (1972) 103-113.
- [2] H. Nikaido and K. Isoda, *Note on non-cooperative convex games*, *Pacific J. Math.* 5: (1955) 807-815.
- [3] Q.H. Ansari, *Vector equilibrium problems and vector variational inequalities*. In: Giannessi, F. (ed.) *Vector variational inequalities and vector equilibria. Mathematical Theories*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, (2000) 116.
- [4] M. Bianchi, M. Hadjisavvas and S. Schaible, *Vector equilibrium problems with generalized monotone bifunctions*, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 92, (1997) 527-542.
- [5] X.B. Li, X.J. Long and J. Zeng, *Hölder Continuity of the Solution Set of the Ky Fan Inequality*, 158, (2013) 397-409.
- [6] X.B. Li and S.J. Li, *Existences of solutions for generalized vector quasiequilibrium problems*, *Optim. Lett.* 4, (2010) 17-28.
- [7] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *Various kinds of semicontinuity and solution sets of parametric multivalued symmetric vector quasiequilibrium problems*, *J. Glob. Optim.* 41, (2008) 539-558.
- [8] N.J. Huang, J. Li and H.B. Thompson, *Stability for parametric implicit vector equilibrium problems*, *Math. Comput. Model.* 43, (2006) 1267-1274.
- [9] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *Continuity of solution maps of parametric quasiequilibrium problems*, *J. Glob. Optim.* 46, (2010) 247-259.
- [10] K. Kimura and J.C. Yao, *Sensitivity analysis of solution mappings of parametric vector quasi-equilibrium problems*, *J. Glob. Optim.* 41, (2008) 187-202.



- [11] C.R. Chen and S.J. Li, *Semicontinuity results on parametric vector variational inequalities with polyhedral constraint sets*, J Optim. Theory Appl. 158, (2013) 97-108.
- [12] M. Bianchi and R. Pini, *A note on stability for parametric equilibrium problems*, Oper. Res. Lett. 31, (2003) 445-450.
- [13] M. Bianchi and R. Pini, *Sensitivity for parametric vector equilibria*, Optimization 55, (2006) 221-230.
- [14] C.R. Chen, S.J. Li and Z.M. Fang, *On the solution semicontinuity to a parametric generalized vector quasivariational inequality*, Comp. Math. Appl. 60, (2010) 2417-2425.
- [15] B. Chen, and N. Huang, *Continuity of the solution mapping to parametric generalized vector equilibrium problems*, J Glob. Optim. 56, (2012) 1515-1528.
- [16] X. Fan, C. Cheng and H. Wang, *Stability analysis for vector quasiequilibrium problems*, Positivity 17, (2013) 365-379.
- [17] Y.D. Xu and S.J. Li, *On the lower semicontinuity of the solution mappings to a parametric generalized strong vector equilibrium problem*, Positivity 17, (2013) 341-353.
- [18] L.Q. Anh, P.Q. Khanh and T.N. Tam, *On Hölder continuity of approximate solutions to parametric equilibrium problems*, Nonlinear Anal. 75, (2012) 2293-2303.
- [19] L.Q. Anh, P.Q. Khanh and T.N. Tam, *On Hölder continuity of solution maps of parametric primal and dual Ky Fan inequalities*, TOP 23, (2015) 151-167.
- [20] S.J. Li and X.B. Li, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric weak generalized Ky Fan inequality*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 149, (2011) 540-553.

- [21] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *Sensitivity analysis for multivalued quasiequilibrium problems in metric spaces: Hölder continuity of solutions*, J. Glob. Optim. 42, (2008) 515-531.
- [22] M. Bianchi and R. Pini, *Sensitivity for parametric vector equilibria*, Optimization 55, (2006) 221-230.
- [23] J. Jahn, *Mathematical Vector Optimization in Partially Ordered Linear Spaces*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt, (1986).
- [24] J. Jahn, *Vector Optimization Theory, Applications and Extensions*, Springer, Berlin, (2004).
- [25] S.J. Li and X.B. Li, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric weak generalized Ky Fan inequality*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 149, (2011) 540-553.
- [26] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *On the Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric multivalued vector equilibrium problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 321, (2006) 308-315.
- [27] C.R. Chen and M.H. Li, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric vector equilibrium problems with nonlinear scalarization*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim. 35, (2014) 685-707.
- [28] C.R. Chen, S.J. Li and K.L. Teo, *Solution semicontinuity of parametric generalized vector equilibrium problems*, J Glob Optim (2009) 45:309318
- [29] Z.Y. Peng, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric generalized vector quasiequilibrium problems*, Abs. Appl. Anal. Article ID 236413 (2012).
- [30] I.V. Konnov and S. Schaible, *Duality for equilibrium problems under generalized monotonicity*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 104, (2000) 395-408.



Search

ISSN 2188-8159

**Linear and Nonlinear Analysis**

Editors  
Y. Kimura  
F. Kohsaka  
T. Suzuki  
W. Takahashi

Volume 1  
Number 1  
2015

Yokohama Publishers

NEW JOURNAL

Open Access

- Volume 1 (2015)
  - Number 1 (JUN)
  - Number 2 (DEC)
- Volume 2 (2016)
  - Number 1 (JUN)
  - Number 2 (DEC)
- Volume 3 (2017)
  - Number 1
  - Number 2
  - Number 3

Editors/Editorial Board

Editorial Policy

For authors

Order Form

Price List



Journals

Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis

Pacific Journal of Optimization

Pure and Applied Functional Analysis  
New Journal (2017)  
Applied Analysis and Optimization

Yokohama Publishers

Conference News  
The 10th International Conference on Nonlinear Analysis and Convex Analysis (NACA 2017), 10th Anniversary, Hokkaido Japan, 2017

NEW Page charge (2017) style file Ina-sample.file

Special Issue on ISBFS2015

Volume 2, Number 2, 2016 (Pub 31, DEC 2016), and Volume 3, Number 1 (Pub. 2017)

### Call for Papers

If your article is accepted please change your tex file to the style of LNA (You can find the style in sample file and please use Ina-sample.file). If you change your tex file to LNA style is difficult, we are willing to modify the file instead of you by option.

## LNA(accepted)

W wataru <wataru@a00.itscom.net>  
จ. 16/10/2017, 17:33  
Rabian Wangkeeree; wataru@a00.itscom.net; อีก +1 คน

☛ ๙ ตอบกลับทั้งหมด | ▼

๙ ตอบกลับทั้งหมด | ▼ ๓ ลบ ขยะ | ▼ ...  
กล่องจดหมายเข้า



Dear Professor Rabian Wangkeeree,

We are pleased to inform you that your paper with Profs. ANH, AND KERDKAEW:

"H OLDER CONTINUITY OF SOLUTION MAPS TO  
PARAMETRIC PRIMAL AND DUAL WEAK GENERALIZED KY  
FAN INEQUALITIES"

has been accepted for publication in Linear and Nonlinear Analysis.

With the aim of speeding up the publication we need the following:

1. pdf-file and tex-file of your manuscript by  
e-mail (wataru@a00.itscom.net) and (takahashi@ybook.co.jp)

With many thank,

LNA Editor  
Wataru Takahashi



# HÖLDER CONTINUITY OF SOLUTION MAPS TO PARAMETRIC PRIMAL AND DUAL WEAK GENERALIZED KY FAN INEQUALITIES

RABIAN WANGKEEREE, LAM QUOC ANH, AND JUTAMAS KERDKAEW

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper we consider primal and dual parametric vector Ky Fan inequality in metric linear spaces. Using the strong convexity and Hölder continuity for vector valued mappings, without strong monotonicity assumption, we establish the sufficient conditions for the solution mappings to these problems to be Hölder continuous around the reference point, when the solution of these problems is not unique. Many examples are provided to illustrate that the imposed assumptions are essential and our results are different from the existed ones in the literature.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Ky Fan inequality has been intensively studied in [1], where the author proposed the existence of a solution for a class of bifunctions. The mathematical formulation of this problem includes various important problems related to optimization, namely, optimization problems, variational inequality, Nash equilibrium problems, fixed-point and coincidence-point problems, etc. It is known that the general form of this problem was investigated earlier by Nikaido and Isoda [2] in 1955. At that time, this problem was carried out as an auxiliary problem to study the existence conditions for Nash equilibrium points in non-cooperative games. In the existence theory of the problem, the key contributions were made by Ky Fan, whose new existence results contained the original techniques which became a basis for most further existence theorems [1]. Hence, this model was also called a Ky Fan inequality.

The Ky Fan inequality has been extended and generalized to vector-valued mappings. This formulation is also known as the generalized Ky Fan inequality. In the literature, existence results for Ky Fan inequalities and the various types of generalized Ky Fan inequalities have been investigated intensively; see [3, 4, 6] and the references therein, where the generalized Ky Fan inequalities are called generalized systems or vector equilibrium problems.

It is well known that stability and sensitivity analysis of solution mappings for (generalized) Ky Fan inequalities is an important topic for (vector) optimization theory and its applications. There have been a large number of contributions to kinds of semicontinuity, continuity and Hölder continuity of solutions with respect

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49K40, 90C31, 91B50.

*Key words and phrases.* Hölder continuity; Parametric vector Ky Fan inequality; Parametric dual vector Ky Fan inequality; Strong convexity.

to parameters. Anh and Khanh [7] introduced some definitions related to semi-continuity of multivalued mappings and discussed various kinds of semicontinuity. They studied the sufficient conditions for the solution sets of parametric multivalued symmetric vector quasiequilibrium problems to have these properties. Huang et al. [8] further considered a class of parametric implicit vector equilibrium problems in Hausdorff topological vector spaces. They established sufficient conditions for the upper semicontinuity and lower semicontinuity of the solution set mapping. Furthermore, the continuity (or Hausdorff continuity) of solution maps was studied in [10, 9]. Kimura and Yao [10] investigated the existence of solutions and continuity of for the parametric vector quasi-equilibrium problem. Anh and Khanh [9] considered a parametric vector quasiequilibrium problem in topological vector spaces

and given some sufficient conditions for solution maps to be lower and Hausdorff lower semicontinuous, upper semicontinuous and continuous. Using scalarization approaches, Chen and Li [11] obtained new results on the lower semicontinuity and upper semicontinuity properties of the Pareto solutions to a parametric vector variational inequality with a polyhedral constraint set. For related results on this field one can also refer to [17, 16, 15, 14, 12, 13].

However, this continuity was obtained under assumptions related to strong monotonicity or strong pseudomonotonicity. Then the results have been extended to quasiequilibrium problems. The case of non-unique solutions was dealt with recently in Anh et al. [18], avoiding assumptions related to strong monotonicity, but Hölder continuity was obtained only for approximate solutions which are as close as we want to exact solutions. In [19], Anh et al. established the sufficient conditions for Hölder continuity of solution mappings of Ky Fan inequalities without using the strong monotonicity assumptions. The technique is based on strong convexity and strong convex-likeness. In [20], Li and Li established the Hölder continuity of a set-valued solution mapping to a parametric weak generalized Fan Ky inequality. It is worth pointing that their method is based on a scalarization representation of the solution mapping for a parametric Ky Fan inequality and the Hölder strong monotonicity assumptions. To the best of our knowledge, there is no existing result on Hölder continuity of primal and dual Ky Fan inequalities for the generalized Ky Fan inequalities without the virtue of Hölder strong monotonicity assumptions.

In this paper, we will first present the new concepts of the strong convexity and Hölder continuity for vector-valued mappings. Further, without the virtue of strong monotonicity assumptions, we next establish also certain sufficient conditions for Hölder continuity of both solution maps of parametric primal and dual weak generalized Ky Fan inequalities, when the solution set may not be singleton. Our technique is based on the strong convexity for vector-valued maps. Examples are provided for cases where our results are applicable while existing ones under the Hölder strong monotonicity assumptions are out of use.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In the sequel,  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  denote the norm and metric in any normed space and metric space, respectively (by the context, no confusion occurs).  $B(0, \delta)$  is the closed ball with center  $0 \in X$  and radius  $\delta \geq 0$ . We use  $\text{int}A$ ,  $\text{conv}(A)$ , and  $\text{diam}A := \sup_{x, z \in A} d(x, z)$  for the interior, the convex hull, and the diameter, respectively, of a

subset  $A$ . For a set-valued map  $G : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ ,  $\text{gr } G := \{(x, y) \in X \times Y : y \in G(x)\}$  is the graph of  $G$ . Recall that  $X$  is called a metric linear space iff it is both a metric space and a linear space and the metric  $d$  of  $X$  is translation invariant (i.e.,  $d(x+z, y+z) = d(x, y)$ ,  $\forall x, y, z \in X$ ) and, for any convergent sequences  $\{\lambda_m\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\{x^m\}$  in  $X$ , we have  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_m x^m) = (\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_m)(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x^m)$ .

Throughout this paper, if not otherwise specified,  $X$  will denote a metric linear space,  $A$  and  $M$  two metric spaces, and  $Y$  a normed space. Let  $Y^*$  be the topological dual space of  $Y$ . For any  $\xi \in Y^*$ , the norm of  $\xi$  is defined by

$$\|\xi\| := \sup\{\langle \xi, x \rangle : \|x\| = 1\},$$

where  $\langle \xi, x \rangle$  denotes the value of  $\xi$  at  $x$ . Let  $C \subseteq Y$  be a pointed, closed and convex cone with  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$  and  $C^* := \{\xi \in Y^* : \langle \xi, x \rangle \geq 0, \forall x \in C\}$  be the dual cone of  $C$ . Since  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ , the dual cone  $C^*$  of  $C$  has a weak\* compact base. For any given point  $e \in \text{int } C$ ,  $B_e^* := \{\xi \in C^* : \langle \xi, e \rangle = 1\}$  is a weak\* compact base of  $C^*$ . We first recall some notions needed in the sequel.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $(E, d)$  be a metric space. For  $A, B \subseteq E$ , the Hausdorff distance between  $A$  and  $B$  is defined by

$$H(A, B) = \max\{H^*(A, B), H^*(B, A)\},$$

where  $H^*(A, B) = \sup_{a \in A} d(a, B)$  and  $d(x, A) = \inf_{y \in A} d(x, y)$ .

Note that  $H(\cdot, \cdot)$  may not be a metric in the space of the subsets of  $E$ , since it can take the value  $\infty$ , and  $H$  is a metric in the space  $\text{CB}(E)$ , the collection of all nonempty, closed and bounded subsets of  $E$ .

Now we recall and introduce some concepts related to Hölder continuity for vector valued mappings.

**Definition 2.2 (Hölder continuity).** Let  $X, Y, M$  and  $C$  be given as above, and  $l, \alpha$  be given positive numbers.

- (i) (classical) A mapping  $g : X \rightarrow Y$ , is called  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous around  $\bar{x} \in X$  iff there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that, for all  $x_1, x_2 \in U$ ,

$$d(g(x_1), g(x_2)) \leq l d^\alpha(x_1, x_2).$$

- (ii) (classical) A set-valued mapping  $G : X \rightarrow 2^Y$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous around  $\bar{x}$  iff there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that for any  $x_1, x_2 \in U$ ,

$$G(x_1) \subset G(x_2) + lB(0, d^\alpha(x_1, x_2)).$$

- (iii) (see [20]) A vector-valued mapping  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  is said to be  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e \in \text{int } C$  around  $\bar{x}$  iff, there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that for any  $x_1, x_2 \in U$ ,

$$g(x_1) \in g(x_2) + l d^\alpha(x_1, x_2)[-e, e],$$

where  $[-e, e] := (e - C) \cap (-e + C)$ .

- (iv) For  $\theta \geq 0$ , a given mapping  $f, f : X \times X \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is called  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e \in \text{int } C$  around  $\bar{\mu} \in M$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in



$A \subseteq X$  iff, there is a neighborhood  $N$  of  $\bar{\mu}$  such that, for all  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in N$  and  $x, y \in A : x \neq y$ ,

$$f(x, y, \mu_1) \in f(x, y, \mu_2) + ld^\alpha(\mu_1, \mu_2)d^\theta(x, y)[-e, e].$$

If the degree of Hölder continuity is equal to 1, then Hölder continuity is called Lipschitz continuity. If a certain property is true at every point of  $B \subseteq X$ , we will said that it is satisfied in  $B$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Monotonicity for vector valued mapping). Let  $X, Y, C$  be as in Definition 2.2,  $g : X \times X \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping, and  $h, \beta$  be positive numbers

(i) ([21])  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -Hölder strongly monotone on  $A \subseteq X$  iff for each  $x, y \in A : x \neq y$ ,

$$g(x, y) + g(y, x) + hd^\beta(x, y)B(0, 1) \subset -C.$$

(ii) ([20])  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -Hölder strongly monotone with respect to  $e \in \text{int } C$  on  $A \subseteq X$  iff for each  $x, y \in A : x \neq y$ ,

$$g(x, y) + g(y, x) + hd^\beta(x, y)e \in -C.$$

(iii) (classical)  $g$  is said to be monotone on  $A \subseteq X$  iff for each  $x, y \in A$ ,

$$g(x, y) + g(y, x) \in -C.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** [23, Lemma 3.21] *If  $Y$  is a real topological linear space and  $C$  is a convex cone with  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ , then*

$$\text{int } C = \left\{ y \in Y : \langle \xi, y \rangle > 0, \forall \xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\} \right\}.$$

Now, we give the topological version of the separation theorem which is also known as Eidelheit's separation theorem.

**Lemma 2.5.** [24] *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be nonempty convex subsets of a real topological linear space  $X$  with  $\text{int } S \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\text{int } S \cap T \neq \emptyset$  if and only if there are a continuous linear functional  $l \in X^* \setminus \{0_{X^*}\}$  and a real number  $\alpha$  with*

$$l(s) \leq \alpha \leq l(t), \text{ for all } s \in S \text{ and } t \in T$$

and

$$l(s) < \alpha, \text{ for all } s \in \text{int } S.$$

Now, we introduce new definitions of the strong convexity and convexity-likeness for the vector valued mappings which are need in this paper.

**Definition 2.6 (Strong convexity).** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric linear space,  $Y$  a normed space. Let  $A \subseteq X$  be a convex subset of  $X$ ,  $C \subseteq Y$  a convex cone with  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping.  $g$  is said to be  $C$ -strongly convex with modulus  $h$  and  $\beta$  on  $A$  iff there exists two positive real number  $h$  and  $\beta$  and a point  $e \in \text{int } C$  such that for all  $x, y \in A$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$(2.1) \quad tg(x) + (1-t)g(y) - ht(1-t)d^\beta(x, y)e \in g(tx + (1-t)y) + C.$$

In this case  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex with respect to  $e$ .

**Remark 2.7.** (i) A mapping  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  is called  $C$ -convex if for all  $x, y \in A$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$tg(x) + (1-t)g(y) \in g(tx + (1-t)y) + C.$$

Clearly, every  $C$ -strongly convex function is  $C$ -convex. However, the converse is not true. For example, if  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}$  and  $g$  is defined by  $g(x) = x^4$ . It is clear that  $g$  is  $C$ -convex but it is not  $C$ -strongly convex as there is no  $h > 0$  that satisfies (2.1).

(ii) If  $Y = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}$  in the above definition, then  $g$  is called  $(h \cdot \beta)$ -strongly convex on  $A$  (see Definition 2.2 [18] and Definition 2.1 [5]).

(iii) The examples of  $C$ -strongly convex vector valued functions can be found in ~~Example 3.5 and Example 3.7.~~

**Definition 2.8 (Strong convex-likeness).** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric linear space,  $Y$  a normed space. Let  $B \subset X$  be a nonempty subset of  $X$ ,  $C \subset Y$  a convex cone with  $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping.

(i)  $g$  is said to be  $C$ -convex-like in  $B$  iff for all  $x_1, x_2 \in B$ , and  $t \in [0, 1]$ , there is  $z \in B$

$$g(z) \in tg(x_1) + (1-t)g(x_2) - C.$$

(ii)  $g$  is said to be  $C$ -strongly convex-like with respect to  $e$  in  $B$  iff there are two positive real numbers  $h$  and  $\beta$  and a point  $e \in \text{int } C$  such that for all  $x_1, x_2 \in B$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$  there is  $z \in B$ ,

$$g(z) + ht(1-t)d^\beta(x_1, x_2)e \in tg(x_1) + (1-t)g(x_2) - C.$$

As usual  $g$  is said to be  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly concave ( $C$ -concave-like, resp.) on  $A$  if  $-g$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex ( $C$ -convex-like, resp.) on  $A$ .

### 3. HÖLDER CONTINUITY OF SOLUTION MAPS OF PARAMETRIC PRIMAL KY FAN INEQUALITIES

Let  $X, Y, \Lambda, M, C$  and  $e$  be as in Section 2, and let  $K : \Lambda \rightarrow 2^X$  be a set-valued mapping with nonempty convex values and  $f : X \times X \times M \rightarrow Y$  be a vector valued mapping. For each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $\mu \in M$ , we consider the following parametric weak generalized Ky Fan inequality (for short, (GKF)) :

$$(3.1) \quad (\text{GKF}) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Find } x_0 \in K(\lambda) \text{ such that} \\ f(x_0, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int } C, \forall y \in K(\lambda). \end{cases}$$

For each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , we denote the solution set of by

$$S(\lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : f(x, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int } C, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

For each  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $\mu \in M$ , the  $\xi$ -solution set of the (GKF) is denoted by

$$S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : \langle \xi, f(x, y, \mu) \rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

In this section, we consider Hölder continuity of solution mappings of (GKF). Since existence conditions of solutions have been studied much in the literature, we do not include existence investigations and always assume that  $S(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty for the considered point  $(\lambda, \mu)$ . Firstly, by using the idea given in [28], we establish

the relationships between the solution sets and the  $\xi$ -solution sets under new mild conditions imposed on the vector valued mappings.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If for each  $x \in K(\lambda)$  and  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $C$ -convex-like in  $K(\lambda)$ , then*

$$S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in B_c^*} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu).$$

*Proof.* (a) We first prove that

$$S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu).$$

Let  $x \in \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$  be arbitrary given. Then, there exists  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $x \in S_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda, \mu)$ . By the definition of  $S_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda, \mu)$ , for each  $y \in K(\lambda)$ ,

$$\langle \bar{\xi}, f(x, y, \mu) \rangle \geq 0.$$

Applying Lemma 2.4, we can see that, for all  $y \in K(\lambda)$ ,  $f(x, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int}C$ . This shows that  $x \in S(\lambda, \mu)$ . Hence, we have that

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) \subseteq S(\lambda, \mu).$$

Conversely, let  $x \in S(\lambda, \mu)$  be arbitrary given. Then, we have that  $f(x, y, \mu) \notin -\text{int}C$  for all  $y \in K(\lambda)$ . Obviously, we have

$$(3.2) \quad f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) \cap (-\text{int}C) = \emptyset.$$

Next, we prove that

$$(f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C) \cap (-\text{int}C) = \emptyset.$$

Suppose on the contrary that, there exists  $w \in (f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C) \cap (-\text{int}C)$ . Hence, there exist  $z \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu)$  and  $c \in C$  such that  $w = z + c \in -\text{int}C$ . So, one has  $z = -c - w \in -\text{int}C$ , which is a contradiction with (3.2). Now, we will show that  $f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C$  is a convex subset of  $Y$ . To this end, let  $z_1, z_2 \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$  be arbitrary given. Then, there are  $y_1, y_2 \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in C$  such that

$$z_i = f(x, y_i, \mu) + c_i, \text{ for all } i = 1, 2.$$

Then, the convex-likeness of the mapping  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  in  $K(\lambda)$  implies that there exist  $s \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c \in C$  such that

$$tf(x, y_1, \mu) + (1-t)f(x, y_2, \mu) = f(x, s, \mu) + c.$$

Since  $C$  is a convex cone, we have

$$\begin{aligned} tz_1 + (1-t)z_2 &= tf(x, y_1, \mu) + tc_1 + (1-t)f(x, y_2, \mu) + (1-t)c_2 \\ &= f(x, s, \mu) + [c + tc_1 + (1-t)c_2] \\ &\in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that  $f(x, K(\lambda), \mu) + C$  is convex. Applying Lemma 2.5, there exist a continuous linear functional  $\xi \in Y^* \setminus \{0\}$  and a number  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\langle \xi, \bar{c} \rangle < \gamma < \langle \xi, z + c \rangle, \forall \bar{c} \in -\text{int}C, \forall z \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu), \forall c \in C.$$

Since  $C$  is a cone, we imply that, for all  $\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$  and  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\alpha\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$ . So,  $\langle \xi, \bar{c} \rangle \leq 0$  for all  $\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$ . Moreover,  $\xi$  is a continuous linear function, one yields  $\langle \xi, c \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $c \in C$ , i.e.,  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $\bar{c} \in -\text{int}C$  can be chosen arbitrarily close to 0, we imply that  $\gamma \geq 0$ . Similarly, since  $c \in C$  also can be taken arbitrarily close to 0 and  $\xi$  is a continuous linear function, we derive that  $\langle \xi, z \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $z \in f(x, K(\lambda), \mu)$ , i.e.,

$$\langle \xi, f(x, y, \mu) \rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda),$$

and hence  $x \in S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$ . So,  $S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$ .

(b) Next we show that

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda, \mu).$$

Since  $B_e^* \subset (C^* \setminus \{0\})$ , one has  $\bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) \supset \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$ . Conversely, for each  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ , from Lemma 2.4 we have  $\langle \xi, e \rangle > 0$  as  $e \in \text{int}C$ . Putting  $\bar{\xi} = \frac{1}{\langle \xi, e \rangle} \xi$ , then  $\bar{\xi} \in B_e^*$  and  $S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) = S_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda, \mu)$ , for all  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , and hence  $S_\xi \subset \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$ , for all  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ . So,  $\bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu) \subset \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** Compared with the results (Lemma 3.1) obtained in [28],  $C$ -convexity of  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  in  $K(\lambda)$  is weakened by  $C$ -convex-likeness of  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  in  $K(\lambda)$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** Suppose that for each  $\xi \in B_e^*$ ,  $S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume the following :

- (i)  $K$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous in a neighborhood  $N(\lambda_0)$  of  $\lambda_0$ ;
- (ii) there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K(N(\lambda_0))$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N(\lambda_0)))$ ;
- (iii) for each  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone in  $K(N(\lambda_0)) \times K(N(\lambda_0))$ ;
- (iv)  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K(N(\lambda_0))$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S$  is single-valued and satisfies the following Hölder condition:

$$(3.3) \quad H(S(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

for each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ .

*Proof.* (a) We first prove that, for each  $\bar{\xi} \in B_e^*$  there are neighborhoods  $N(\bar{\xi})$ ,  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$  such that for each  $\xi \in N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0) \times N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$ ,

$$(3.4) \quad \rho(S_\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2),$$

where  $\rho(A, B) := \sup\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$  for each  $A, B \subset Y$ .

The proof of (3.4) is separated into three steps:

Step I: For any given two points  $x_{11} \in S_\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we claim that

$$d_1 := d(x_{11}, x_{21}) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

From the definition of  $S_\xi$ , we have that, for all  $y \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $z \in K(\lambda_2)$ ,

$$(3.5) \quad \min \left\{ \langle \xi, f(x_{11}, y, \mu_1) \rangle, \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, z, \mu_1) \rangle \right\} \geq 0.$$

It follows from the  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuity of  $K$  imposed in (i), there are  $x_1 \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $x_2 \in K(\lambda_2)$  satisfying

$$(3.6) \quad \max \left\{ d(x_{11}, x_2), d(x_{21}, x_1) \right\} \leq ld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

~~Taking  $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21})$ , it is clear that  $\bar{x} \in \text{conv}(K(N(\lambda_0)))$ . Since  $f(x_{11}, \cdot, \mu_1)$  is~~  
 $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strong convexity with respect to  $e$ , we have that

$$f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta e \in -C.$$

Then, it follows from the definition of  $B_e^*$  that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left\langle \xi, f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta e \right\rangle \\ &= \langle \xi, f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) \rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \\ &\quad - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta e \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which arrives that

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta \leq \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \langle \xi, f(x_{11}, \bar{x}, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

Since  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  is monotone and  $x_{11} \in S_\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ , we have

$$(3.8) \quad \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle = 0$$

and

$$(3.9) \quad \left\langle \xi, f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

Using (3.7), (3.8) and (3.9), we imply that

$$(3.10) \quad \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta \leq -\left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle.$$

Taking  $z = x_2$  and  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1)$  in (3.5), we can get that

$$(3.11) \quad \min \left\{ \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), \mu_1\right) \right\rangle, \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \rangle \right\} \geq 0.$$

Hence, (3.10) and (3.11) together yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq -\left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_1}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\
&\leq \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_1}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\
&\leq \left| \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_1}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{11}, \frac{x_{11} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_2, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (3.6) and the  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_{11}, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $f(x_{21}, \cdot, \mu_1)$  given in (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq \frac{1}{2}md(x_{11}, x_2) + \frac{1}{2}md(x_{21}, x_1) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \frac{1}{2}mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \\
&\leq mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives that

$$d_1 \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Step II: We claim that for any given two points  $x_{21} \in S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{22} \in S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ ,

$$d_2 := d(x_{21}, x_{22}) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

By the definition of  $\xi$ -solutions, we have that, for all  $y, z \in K(\lambda_2)$ ,

$$(3.12) \quad \min \left\{ \left\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, y, \mu_1) \right\rangle, \left\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, z, \mu_2) \right\rangle \right\} \geq 0.$$

Putting  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22})$  in (3.12), it is clear that  $y \in K(\lambda_2)$ , and hence

$$\left\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, y, \mu_1) \right\rangle \geq 0.$$

By virtue of the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strong convexity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_{21}, \cdot, \mu_1)$ , one has

$$f\left(x_{21}, \frac{x_{21} + x_{22}}{2}, \mu_1\right) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta e \in -C.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{21}, \frac{x_{21} + x_{22}}{2}, \mu_1\right) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta e \right\rangle \\
&\geq \left\langle \xi, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^\beta e \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , one yields

$$(3.13) \quad \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle - \frac{h}{2} d_2^\beta \geq 0.$$

By the monotonicity of  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we obtain

$$(3.14) \quad \xi(f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1)) = 0$$

and

$$(3.15) \quad \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

From (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15), we imply that

$$(3.16) \quad \frac{h}{2} d_2^\beta \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

Now, replacing  $z$  in (3.12) by  $\frac{1}{2}(x_{22} + x_{21})$ , we have

$$(3.17) \quad \left\langle \xi, f\left(x_{22}, \frac{x_{22} + x_{21}}{2}, \mu_2\right) \right\rangle \geq 0.$$

By the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strong convexity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_{22}, \cdot, \mu_2)$ , we obtain the following inequality which is similar to (3.13), concretely

$$\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \rangle - \frac{h}{2} d_2^\beta \geq 0.$$

As  $\xi(f(x_{22}, x_{22}, \mu_2)) = 0$ ,

$$(3.18) \quad \frac{h}{2} d_2^\beta \leq \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) \rangle.$$

Summing (3.16) and (3.18) and combining with assumption (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} h d_2^\beta &\leq \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) \rangle - \langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle \\ &\leq |\langle \xi, f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_2) - f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle| \\ &\leq n d^\gamma(\mu_1, \mu_2) d_2^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$d_2 \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Step III: Finally, applying Step I and Step II, for each  $x_{11} \in S_\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{22} \in S_\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ , we have

$$d(x_{11}, x_{22}) \leq d_1 + d_2 \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Hence, we get

$$(3.19) \quad \rho(S^\xi(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S^\xi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

(b) Now we prove (3.3). We see that  $B_e^*$  is a weak\* compact set and hence it can be covered by finitely many open sets, i.e.,

$$(3.20) \quad B_e^* \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n N(\xi_i),$$

where  $\xi_i \in B_e^*$  and  $N(\xi_i)$  is a neighborhood of  $\xi_i$ , defined in (a). For  $N_{\xi_i}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N_{\xi_i}(\mu_0)$  determined as in (a), let  $N'(\lambda_0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n N_{\xi_i}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n N_{\xi_i}(\mu_0)$ . For each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$  and  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , it follows from (3.20) that there exists  $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $\xi \in N(\xi_{i_0})$  and obviously,  $(\lambda, \mu) \in N_{\xi_{i_0}}(\lambda_0) \times N_{\xi_{i_0}}(\mu_0)$ . Combining the convexity of  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  assumed in (ii) with Lemma 3.2, we have

$$S(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_{\xi}(\lambda, \mu).$$

For each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ , we now show that

$$(3.21) \quad H(S(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Indeed, for each  $x_{11} \in S(\lambda_1, \mu_1) = \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_{\xi}(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ , there is  $\hat{\xi} \in B_e^*$  such that  $x_{11} \in S_{\hat{\xi}}(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ . As  $S_{\hat{\xi}}(\lambda_2, \mu_2) \subseteq S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$  and applying (a), one has

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{11}, S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) &\leq d(x_{11}, S_{\hat{\xi}}(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \\ &\leq H^*(S_{\hat{\xi}}(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_{\hat{\xi}}(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \\ &\leq \rho(S_{\hat{\xi}}(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_{\hat{\xi}}(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(3.22) \quad H^*(S(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Similarly, we also have

$$(3.23) \quad H^*(S(\lambda_2, \mu_2), S(\lambda_1, \mu_1)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Combining (3.22) with (3.23), we obtain (3.3). Furthermore, setting  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$  and  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  in the inequality (3.3), we can see that the diameter of the solution set  $S(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  is 0 (for arbitrary  $(\lambda_1, \mu_2)$ ), i.e., the solution map  $S$  of (GKF) is single-valued in  $N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** (i) Compared with the results obtained in [18], the real valued function  $f$  is generalized to the vector valued function. Further, the strong convexity for the real valued function is extended to  $C$ -strong convexity for the vector valued function.



- (ii) Comparing Theorem 3.3 and the results obtained in [25, 26, 27, 29], we can see that the main difference is the assumption (ii), namely, we assume that  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N(\lambda_0)))$  in Theorem 3.3 but strong monotone in [25], or strong pseudomonotone in [26, 27] or  $f$  is satisfied a condition related to strong monotonicity in [29]. Hence, Theorem 3.3 can be applicable in the general case of non-unique solutions while the aforementioned results do not work as in the following example.

**Example 3.5.** Let  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\Lambda \equiv M = [0, 1]$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ ,  $e = (1, 1)$ ,  $K(\lambda) = [-1 - \lambda, 1 + \lambda]$ ,  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ , and

$$f(x, y, \lambda) = ((\lambda + 1)(y_1^2 - x_1^2), (\lambda + 1)(y_2^2 - x_2^2)),$$

where  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ . It is not hard to see that all assumptions of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied and  $S(\lambda) \equiv \{(0, 0)\}$  is Hölder continuous. However, we can see that

$$f((1, 1), (-1, -1), \lambda) = f((-1, -1), (1, 1), \lambda) = (0, 0), \text{ for all } \lambda \in M.$$

Hence the assumptions on strong monotonicity in [25], strong pseudo-monotonicity in [26, 27] and some conditions related to strong monotonicity in [29] are not satisfied. Thus, the main results given in [26, 27, 29] do not work while Theorem 3.3 can be applicable.

To illustrate the essential of imposed assumptions which do not relate to Hölder continuity in Theorem 3.3, we bring out some following examples.

**Example 3.6** (the strong convexity is essential). Let  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\Lambda \equiv M = [0, 1]$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ ,  $e = (1, 1)$ ,  $K(\lambda) = [\lambda, 1]$ ,  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ , and  $f(x, y, \lambda) = (\lambda(x_1^2 - y_1^2), \lambda(x_2^2 - y_2^2))$ , where  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ . Then, all assumptions of Theorem 3.3 are fulfilled, except for the strong convexity of  $f$ . By direct calculations, we have

$$S(\lambda) = \begin{cases} [0, 1] \times [0, 1], & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \\ \{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

which is not lower semicontinuous at  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ .

**Example 3.7** (the monotonicity is crucial). Let  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\Lambda \equiv M = [0, 1]$ ,  $C = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ ,  $e = (1, 1)$ ,  $K(\lambda) \equiv [0, 1]$ ,  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ , and  $f(x, y, \lambda) = (y_1^2 - \lambda x_1, y_2^2 - \lambda x_2)$ , where  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in X$ .  $f(x, y, \lambda) = y^2 - \lambda x$ . Then, it is not hard to see that the assumptions of Theorem 3.3 are satisfied, except the monotonicity of  $f$  ( $f(x, y, 0) + f(y, x, 0) = (y_1^2 + x_1^2, y_2^2 + x_2^2) > 0$  assumed in the theorem, for many  $x, y \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ ). Direct computations give us the solution set

$$S(\lambda) = \begin{cases} [0, 1] \times [0, 1], & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \\ \{(0, 0)\}, & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

which is even not lower semicontinuous at  $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ .

In the special case where  $K(\lambda) \equiv K$  ( $K$  is a nonempty set), the strong convexity in assumption (ii) of Theorem 3.3 can be reduced to the strong convex-likeness along with several other relaxations, and we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 3.8.** For (KF) with  $K(\lambda) \equiv K$ . Suppose that for each  $\xi \in B_e^*$ ,  $S_\xi(\lambda, \mu)$  is nonempty in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume the following :

- (i) there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(x, \cdot, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly convex-like with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}K$ ;
- (ii) for each  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone in  $K \times K$ ;
- (iii)  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S$  satisfies the following Hölder condition: For each  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in N'(\mu_0)$ ,

$$(3.24) \quad H(S(\mu_1), S(\mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

*Proof.* (a) We first prove that, for each  $\bar{\xi} \in B_e^*$  there are neighborhoods  $N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$  such that for each  $\xi \in N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$ ,

$$(3.25) \quad \rho(S_\xi(\mu_1), S_\xi(\mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2),$$

where  $\rho(A, B) := \sup\{d(a, b) : a \in A, b \in B\}$  for each  $A, B \subset Y$ .

Firstly, we claim that for any given two points  $x_1 \in S_\xi(\mu_1)$  and  $x_2 \in S_\xi(\mu_2)$ ,

$$d(x_1, x_2) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

By the definition of  $\xi$ -solutions, we have that, for all  $y, z \in K$ ,

$$(3.26) \quad \min \left\{ \langle \xi, f(x_1, y, \mu_1) \rangle, \langle \xi, f(x_2, z, \mu_2) \rangle \right\} \geq 0.$$

Putting  $y = x_2 \in K$  in (3.26), we have that

$$\langle \xi, f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) \rangle \geq 0.$$

By virtue of the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strong convex-likeness with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_2, \cdot, \mu_1)$ , we have that there is  $v \in K$  such that

$$f(x_1, v, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d^\beta(x_1, x_2)e \in -C.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left\langle \xi, f(x_1, v, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d^\beta(x_1, x_2)e \right\rangle \\ &\geq \left\langle \xi, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) - \frac{1}{2}f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d^\beta(x_1, x_2)e \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , one yields

$$(3.27) \quad \langle \xi, f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle - \frac{h}{2}d^\beta(x_1, x_2) \geq 0.$$

By the monotonicity of  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_1 \in S_\xi(\mu_1)$ , we obtain

$$(3.28) \quad \xi(f(x_1, x_1, \mu_1)) = 0$$

and

$$(3.29) \quad \langle \xi, f(x_1, x_2, \mu_1) \rangle \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

From (3.27), (3.28) and (3.29), we have that

$$(3.30) \quad \frac{h}{2}d^\beta(x_1, x_2) \leq -\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

Now, replacing  $w$  in (3.26) by  $x_1$ , we have

$$(3.31) \quad \langle \xi, f(x_2, z, \mu_2) \rangle = \langle \xi, f(x_2, w, \mu_2) \rangle \geq 0.$$

~~By the  $(h-\beta)$ - $C$ -strong convex-likeness with respect to  $e$  of  $f(x_2, \cdot, \mu_2)$ , we obtain the following inequality which is similar to (3.27), concretely~~

$$\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) \rangle + \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_2, \mu_2) \rangle - \frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \geq 0.$$

As  $\xi(f(x_2, x_2, \mu_2)) = 0$ ,

$$(3.32) \quad \frac{h}{2}d_2^\beta \leq \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) \rangle.$$

Summing (3.30) and (3.32) and combining with assumption (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} hd_2^\beta &\leq \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) \rangle - \langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle \\ &\leq |\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_1, \mu_2) - f(x_2, x_1, \mu_1) \rangle| \\ &\leq nd^\gamma(\mu_1, \mu_2)d_2^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$d(x_1, x_2) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Hence, we get

$$(3.33) \quad \rho(S_\xi(\mu_1), S_\xi(\mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-\theta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

(b) Proving (3.24) is similar to the proof of (3.24) in Theorem 3.3 and hence we can get our result. □

#### 4. HÖLDER CONTINUITY OF SOLUTION MAPS OF PARAMETRIC DUAL KY FAN INEQUALITIES

Let  $X, Y, \Lambda, M, C, e, K, f$  be as in Section 3. For each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , we consider the following parametric dual weak generalized Ky Fan inequality:

(DKF) Find  $x_0 \in K(\lambda)$ , such that

$$(4.1) \quad f(y, x_0, \mu) \notin \text{int}C, \forall y \in K(\lambda).$$

As usual, for each  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ , the solution set of (DKF) is denoted by

$$S^d(\lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : f(y, x, \mu) \notin \text{int}C, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

For each  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\lambda \in N(\lambda_0)$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ , the  $\xi$ -solution set of (DKF) is denoted by

$$S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu) := \{x \in K(\lambda) : \langle \xi, f(y, x, \mu) \rangle \leq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda)\}.$$

Note that we can not compare the solution sets of primal problems (KF) with that of the dual problems (DKF) in general (see, Example 2.1 in [19]). However, under some suitable assumptions we can get certain relationships between both of them (see [30]). In this section, we focuss on the Hölder continuity of solution mappings of (DKF) and always assume that all kinds of solution sets of the problems are nonempty in the neighborhood of the reference point. The following lemma plays an important role in the proof of our main result.

**Lemma 4.1.** *If for each  $x \in K(\lambda)$  and  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times M$ ,  $f(\cdot, x, \mu)$  is  $C$ -concave-like in  $K(\lambda)$ , then*

$$S^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu).$$

*Proof.* We first show that

$$S^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu).$$

Let  $x \in \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu)$ , there is  $\bar{\xi} \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $x \in S_{\bar{\xi}}^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . So,

$$\langle \bar{\xi}, f(y, x, \mu) \rangle \leq 0, \forall y \in K(\lambda).$$

Combining above affirmation with Lemma 2.4, we imply that  $f(y, x, \mu) \notin \text{int}C$ , for all  $y \in K(\lambda)$ . Hence  $x \in S^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . Conversely, let  $x \in S^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . By the definition of (DKF), we have

$$f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) \cap (\text{int}C) = \emptyset,$$

and hence,

$$(f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C) \cap (\text{int}C) = \emptyset.$$

Let  $z_1, z_2 \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C$ , there are  $y_1, y_2 \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in C$  such that  $z_i = f(y_i, x, \mu) - c_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $f(\cdot, x, \mu)$  is concave-like in  $K(\lambda)$ , for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , there are  $s \in K(\lambda)$  and  $c \in C$  such that

$$tf(y_1, x, \mu) + (1-t)f(y_2, x, \mu) = f(s, x, \mu) - c,$$

i.e.,  $tz_1 + (1-t)z_2 = f(s, x, \mu) - tc_1 - (1-t)c_2 - c \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C$ , and hence  $f(K(\lambda), x, \mu) - C$  is a convex subset of  $Y$ . By the virtue of Lemma 2.5, we obtain a continuous linear functional  $\xi \in Y^* \setminus \{0\}$  and a number  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\langle \xi, z - c \rangle < \gamma < \langle \xi, \bar{c} \rangle, \forall z \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu), \forall c \in C, \forall \bar{c} \in \text{int}C.$$

Since  $C$  is a cone, we have  $\langle \xi, \bar{c} \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $\bar{c} \in \text{int}C$ , and hence we also have  $\langle \xi, c \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $c \in C$ , i.e.,  $\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $\bar{c} \in \text{int}C$  and  $c \in C$  can chosen arbitrarily close to 0, we yield  $\gamma \geq 0$  and  $\langle \xi, z \rangle \leq 0$  for all  $z \in f(K(\lambda), x, \mu)$ , and hence  $x \in S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . So,  $S^d(\lambda, \mu) = \bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu)$ . Using the given arguments as in Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in C^* \setminus \{0\}} S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu) \subset \bigcup_{\xi \in B_e^*} S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu).$$

□

Applying Lemma 4.1, we establish sufficient conditions for the solution mappings of (DKF) to be Hölder continuous.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose that for each  $\xi \in B_e^*$ , the  $\xi$ -solution set  $S_\xi^d(\lambda, \mu)$  exists in a neighborhood of the considered point  $(\lambda_0, \mu_0)$ . Furthermore, assume that the following assumptions are satisfied:*

- (i)  $K$  is  $(l \cdot \alpha)$ -Hölder continuous in a neighborhood  $N(\lambda_0)$  of  $\lambda_0$ ;
- (ii) there is a neighborhood  $N(\mu_0)$  of  $\mu_0$  such that for all  $x \in K(N(\lambda_0))$  and  $\mu \in N(\mu_0)$ ,  $f(\cdot, x, \mu)$  is  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly concave with respect to  $e$  as well as  $(m \cdot 1)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  in  $\text{conv}(K(N))$ ;
- (iii) for each  $\mu \in U(\mu_0)$ ,  $-f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu)$  is monotone on  $K(N(\lambda_0)) \times K(N(\lambda_0))$ ;
- (iv)  $f$  is  $(n \cdot \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with respect to  $e$  around  $\mu_0$ ,  $\theta$ -uniformly in  $K(N(\lambda_0))$  with  $\theta < \beta$ .

Then, there exist neighborhoods of  $N'(\lambda_0)$  and  $N'(\mu_0)$  such that  $S^d$  is single-valued and satisfies the following Hölder condition: for each  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N'(\lambda_0) \times N'(\mu_0)$ ,

$$(4.2) \quad H(S^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S^d(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

*Proof.* We first show that, for each  $\bar{\xi} \in B_e^*$  there are neighborhoods  $N(\bar{\xi})$ ,  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0)$  and  $N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$  such that for each  $\xi \in N(\bar{\xi})$  and  $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in N_{\bar{\xi}}(\lambda_0) \times N_{\bar{\xi}}(\mu_0)$

$$(4.3) \quad \rho(S_\xi^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1), S_\xi^d(\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

To this end, the proof of (4.3) is divided into three steps:

Step I: For any given two points  $x_{11} \in S_\xi^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_\xi^d(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we claim that

$$d_1 := d(x_{11}, x_{21}) \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

By the construction of  $S_\xi^d$ , for all  $y \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $z \in K(\lambda_2)$ , we have

$$(4.4) \quad \max \left\{ \langle \xi, f(y, x_{11}, \mu_1) \rangle, \langle \xi, f(z, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle \right\} \leq 0.$$

Thanks to (i), there are  $x_1 \in K(\lambda_1)$  and  $x_2 \in K(\lambda_2)$  such that

$$(4.5) \quad \max \left\{ d(x_{11}, x_2), d(x_{21}, x_1) \right\} \leq ld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Putting  $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21})$ , it follows from the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strongly concavity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(\cdot, x_{11}, \mu_1)$  that

$$-f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta e \in -C.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \left\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta e \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \\ &\quad + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta e \right\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which arrives that

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta \leq -\left\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle.$$

On the other hand, combining the monotonicity of  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{11} \in S_\xi^d(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$ , one has

$$(4.7) \quad \left\langle \xi, f(x_{11}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle = 0$$

and

$$(4.8) \quad \left\langle \xi, f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \geq -\left\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle.$$

Combining (4.6), (4.7) and (4.8), one gets

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta \leq -\left\langle \xi, -f(\bar{x}, x_{11}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle.$$

Now, setting  $z = x_2$  and  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1)$  in (4.4), we have

$$(4.10) \quad \min \left\{ -\left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle, -\left\langle \xi, f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \right\} \geq 0.$$

Hence, from (4.9) and (4.10), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21}), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\ &\quad - \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21}), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left| \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_{21}), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{11} + x_1), x_{11}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_{11}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \left\langle \xi, \frac{1}{2}f(x_2, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h}{4}d_1^\beta &\leq \frac{1}{2}md(x_{21}, x_1) + \frac{1}{2}md(x_{11}, x_2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}md^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + \frac{1}{2}md^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \\ &= mld^\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2), \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$d_1 \leq \left(\frac{4ml}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

Step II : Next we prove that for any given points  $x_{21} \in S_{\xi}^d(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{22} \in S_{\xi}^d(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ ,

$$d_2 := d(x_{21}, x_{22}) \leq \left(\frac{m}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

By the definition of  $S_{\xi}^d$ , all  $y, z \in K(\lambda_2)$ , we get

$$(4.11) \quad \max\left\{\langle \xi, f(y, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle, \langle \xi, f(z, x_{22}, \mu_2) \rangle\right\} \leq 0.$$

Substituting  $y = \frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22})$  in (4.11), we obtain

$$\left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22}), x_{21}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \leq 0,$$

which implies that

$$-\left\langle \xi, f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22}), x_{21}, \mu_1\right) \right\rangle \geq 0.$$

By virtue of the  $(h \cdot \beta)$ - $C$ -strong concavity with respect to  $e$  of  $f(\cdot, x_{21}, \mu_1)$ , we get

$$-f\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_{21} + x_{22}), x_{21}, \mu_1\right) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{1}{2}f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) + \frac{h}{4}d_2^{\beta}e \in -C.$$

By virtue of the linearity of  $\xi$  and above discussion, we imply that

$$(4.12) \quad \left\langle \xi, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle + \left\langle \xi, -\frac{1}{2}f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \right\rangle - \frac{h}{4}d_2^{\beta} \geq 0.$$

From the monotonicity of  $-f(\cdot, \cdot, \mu_1)$  and  $x_{21} \in S_{\xi}^d(\lambda_2, \mu_1)$ , we have

$$(4.13) \quad \xi(f(x_{21}, x_{21}, \mu_1)) = 0$$

and

$$(4.14) \quad \langle \xi, -f(x_{22}, x_{21}, \mu_1) \rangle \leq \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

Hence, combining (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14), one has

$$(4.15) \quad \frac{h}{2}d_2^{\beta} \leq \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle.$$

Similarly, by setting  $z = \frac{1}{2}(x_{22} + x_{21})$  in (4.11), and using the above discussion, we also imply that

$$(4.16) \quad \frac{h}{2}d_2^{\beta} \leq \langle \xi, -f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \rangle = -\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \rangle.$$

Summing (4.15) and (4.16) and combining with (iv), we establish

$$\begin{aligned} hd_2^{\beta} &\leq \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle - \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \rangle \\ &\leq |\langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_1) \rangle - \langle \xi, f(x_{21}, x_{22}, \mu_2) \rangle| \\ &\leq nd^{\gamma}(\mu_1, \mu_2)d_2^{\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$d_2 \leq \left(\frac{n}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} d^{\frac{\gamma}{\beta-\theta}}(\mu_1, \mu_2),$$

and thus, (4.3) is derived from the conclusions of Steps I and II. Finally, using the given the same argument in the proof of Theorem 3.3, we can arrive the desired conclusion.  $\square$

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, by using the strong convexity and Hölder continuity for both the ~~vector valued mappings of the primal and dual parametric vector Ky-Fan inequality~~ in metric linear spaces, without strong monotonicity assumption, we presented the sufficient conditions for the mentioned solution mappings to be Hölder continuous around the reference point, when the solution of these problems is not unique. Finally, we provided many examples to illustrate that the imposed assumptions are essential.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is partially supported by the Science Achivement Scholarship of Thailand, Naresuan university and funded by Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) under grant number 101.01-2014.44.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Fan, *A minimax inequality and applications*. In: Shisha O (ed) *Inequality III* Academic Press, New York. (1972) 103-113.
- [2] H. Nikaido and K. Isoda, *Note on non-cooperative convex games*, *Pacific J. Math.* 5: (1955) 807-815.
- [3] Q.H. Ansari, *Vector equilibrium problems and vector variational inequalities*. In: Giannessi, F. (ed.) *Vector variational inequalities and vector equilibria*. Mathematical Theories, Kluwer, Dordrecht, (2000) 116.
- [4] M. Bianchi, M. Hadjisavvas and S. Schaible, *Vector equilibrium problems with generalized monotone bifunctions*, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 92, (1997) 527-542.
- [5] X.B. Li, X.J. Long and J. Zeng, *Hölder Continuity of the Solution Set of the Ky Fan Inequality*, 158, (2013) 397-409.
- [6] X.B. Li and S.J. Li, *Existences of solutions for generalized vector quasiequilibrium problems*, *Optim. Lett.* 4, (2010) 17-28.
- [7] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *Various kinds of semicontinuity and solution sets of parametric multivalued symmetric vector quasiequilibrium problems*, *J. Glob. Optim.* 41, (2008) 539-558.
- [8] N.J. Huang, J. Li and H.B. Thompson, *Stability for parametric implicit vector equilibrium problems*, *Math. Comput. Model.* 43, (2006) 1267-1274.
- [9] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *Continuity of solution maps of parametric quasiequilibrium problems*, *J. Glob. Optim.* 46, (2010) 247-259.
- [10] K. Kimura and J.C. Yao, *Sensitivity analysis of solution mappings of parametric vector quasiequilibrium problems*, *J. Glob. Optim.* 41, (2008) 187-202.
- [11] C.R. Chen and S.J. Li, *Semicontinuity results on parametric vector variational inequalities with polyhedral constraint sets*, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 158, (2013) 97-108.
- [12] M. Bianchi and R. Pini, *A note on stability for parametric equilibrium problems*, *Oper. Res. Lett.* 31, (2003) 445-450.



- [13] M. Bianchi and R. Pini, *Sensitivity for parametric vector equilibria*, Optimization 55, (2006) 221-230.
- [14] C.R. Chen, S.J. Li and Z.M. Fang, *On the solution semicontinuity to a parametric generalized vector quasivariational inequality*, Comp. Math. Appl. 60, (2010) 2417-2425.
- [15] B. Chen, and N. Huang, *Continuity of the solution mapping to parametric generalized vector equilibrium problems*, J Glob. Optim. 56, (2012) 1515-1528.
- [16] X. Fan, C. Cheng and H. Wang, *Stability analysis for vector quasiequilibrium problems*, Positivity 17, (2013) 365-379.
- [17] Y.D. Xu and S.J. Li, *On the lower semicontinuity of the solution mappings to a parametric generalized strong vector equilibrium problem*, Positivity 17, (2013) 341-353.
- [18] L.Q. Anh, P.Q. Khanh and T.N. Tam, *On Hölder continuity of approximate solutions to parametric equilibrium problems*, Nonlinear Anal. 75, (2012) 2293-2303.
- [19] ~~L.Q. Anh, P.Q. Khanh and T.N. Tam, *On Hölder continuity of solution maps of parametric primal and dual Ky Fan inequalities*, TOP 23, (2015) 151-167.~~
- [20] S.J. Li and X.B. Li, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric weak generalized Ky Fan inequality*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 149, (2011) 540-553.
- [21] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *Sensitivity analysis for multivalued quasiequilibrium problems in metric spaces: Hölder continuity of solutions*, J. Glob. Optim. 42, (2008) 515-531.
- [22] M. Bianchi and R. Pini, *Sensitivity for parametric vector equilibria*, Optimization 55, (2006) 221-230.
- [23] J. Jahn, *Mathematical Vector Optimization in Partially Ordered Linear Spaces*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt, (1986).
- [24] J. Jahn, *Vector Optimization Theory, Applications and Extensions*, Springer, Berlin, (2004).
- [25] S.J. Li and X.B. Li, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric weak generalized Ky Fan inequality*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 149, (2011) 540-553.
- [26] L.Q. Anh and P.Q. Khanh, *On the Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric multivalued vector equilibrium problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 321, (2006) 308-315.
- [27] C.R. Chen and M.H. Li, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric vector equilibrium problems with nonlinear scalarization*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim. 35, (2014) 685-707.
- [28] C.R. Chen, S.J. Li and K.L. Teo, *Solution semicontinuity of parametric generalized vector equilibrium problems*, J Glob Optim (2009) 45:309318
- [29] Z.Y. Peng, *Hölder continuity of solutions to parametric generalized vector quasiequilibrium problems*, Abs. Appl. Anal. Article ID 236413 (2012).
- [30] I.V. Konnov and S. Schaible, *Duality for equilibrium problems under generalized monotonicity*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 104, (2000) 395-408.

(R. Wangkeeree) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, NARESUAN UNIVERSITY, PHITSANULOK 65000, THAILAND  
*E-mail address:* rabianw@nu.ac.th

(L. Q. Anh) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEACHER COLLEGE, CANTHO UNIVERSITY, CANTHO, VIETNAM  
*E-mail address:* quocanh@ctu.edu.vn

(J. Kerdkaew) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, NARESUAN UNIVERSITY, PHITSANULOK 65000, THAILAND  
*E-mail address:* rabianw@nu.ac.th