

# A proximal subgradient algorithm for constrained multiobjective DC-type optimization

Nguyen Van Tuyen\*, Minh N. Dao<sup>†</sup> and Tran Van Nghi<sup>‡</sup>

December 31, 2025

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider a class of constrained multiobjective optimization problems, where each objective function can be expressed by adding a possibly nonsmooth nonconvex function and a differentiable function with Lipschitz continuous gradient, then subtracting a weakly convex function. This encompasses multiobjective optimization problems involving difference-of-convex (DC) functions, which are prevalent in various applications due to their ability to model non-convex problems. We first establish necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for these problems, providing a theoretical foundation for algorithm development. Building on these conditions, we propose a proximal subgradient algorithm tailored to the structure of the objectives. Under mild assumptions, the sequence generated by the proposed algorithm is bounded and each of its cluster points is a stationary solution.

**Keywords:** DC programming, multiobjective optimization, optimality conditions, proximal subgradient algorithm.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (MSC 2020):** 90C26, 90C29, 90C46, 65K05.

## 1. Introduction

Multiobjective optimization is a field that seeks to optimize multiple conflicting objectives simultaneously, often requiring trade-offs among the objectives due to the absence of a universally optimal solution. Such problems are fundamental in diverse domains, including economics, engineering, and the sciences, where decision-making processes necessitate balancing competing goals effectively; see, e.g., [4, 6, 11, 14, 21].

In this paper, we consider a class of constrained multiobjective optimization problems where each objective function is formed by adding a possibly nonsmooth nonconvex function and a differentiable function with Lipschitz continuous gradient, then subtracting a weakly convex function. This general formulation encompasses multiobjective optimization problems involving difference-of-convex (DC) functions, a widely studied subclass of nonconvex optimization problems. DC optimization problems naturally arise in applications such as portfolio optimization, engineering design, and

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Hanoi Pedagogical University 2, Xuan Hoa, Phu Tho, Vietnam. E-mail: [nguyenvantuyen83@hpu2.edu.vn](mailto:nguyenvantuyen83@hpu2.edu.vn); [tuyensp2@yahoo.com](mailto:tuyensp2@yahoo.com).

<sup>†</sup>School of Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, VIC 3000, Australia. E-mail: [minh.dao@rmit.edu.au](mailto:minh.dao@rmit.edu.au).

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, Hanoi Pedagogical University 2, Xuan Hoa, Phu Tho, Vietnam. E-mail: [tranvan-nghi@hpu2.edu.vn](mailto:tranvan-nghi@hpu2.edu.vn).

location analysis, where nonconvexity is intrinsic to the problem structure. The study of DC optimization has garnered significant attention due to its ability to model a broad range of nonconvex problems while retaining certain advantages of convex optimization; see, e.g., [2, 5, 9, 13, 18, 22]. Despite its potential, solving DC multiobjective problems remains challenging due to the inherent nonconvexity of the objective functions and the need to handle multiple objectives simultaneously.

Scalar optimization methods for DC functions have been extensively studied and provide a foundation for tackling these problems. However, extending these approaches to the multiobjective setting introduces unique challenges. Multiobjective problems require managing the interplay between competing objectives, often necessitating sophisticated adaptations to traditional optimization techniques. Additionally, the constrained nature of these problems, involving feasibility requirements for decision variables, further complicates their resolution.

In this work, we address these challenges by first establishing necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for the considered class of constrained multiobjective optimization problems. These conditions generalize concepts from scalar optimization to the multiobjective domain, offering a theoretical framework for designing effective algorithms. Building on these conditions, we propose a proximal subgradient algorithm that exploits the DC structure of the objectives. Under mild assumptions, we demonstrate that the sequence generated by this algorithm is bounded, and its cluster points are stationary solutions.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the preliminaries, including key definitions and concepts relevant to multiobjective DC optimization. In Section 3, we derive the necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for the considered problem class. Section 4 introduces the proposed proximal subgradient algorithm and presents its convergence analysis. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and discusses possible directions for future research.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let us recall some notions related to generalized differentiation from [15, 16, 20]. Throughout the paper, we deal with the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$  equipped with the usual scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and the corresponding norm  $\| \cdot \|$ . The closed ball centered at  $x$  with radius  $r$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{B}_r(x)$ ; when  $x$  is the origin of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  we write  $\mathbb{B}_r$  instead of  $\mathbb{B}_r(x)$ . The topological interior, the convex hull, and the nonnegative hull of a set  $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  are denoted, respectively, by  $\text{int } D$ ,  $\text{co } D$ , and  $\text{pos } D$ .

Let  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$  be a set-valued mapping. The *domain* and the *graph* of  $F$  are given, respectively, by

$$\text{dom } F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid F(x) \neq \emptyset\}$$

and

$$\text{gph } F = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \mid y \in F(x)\}.$$

We say that  $F$  is *proper* if  $\text{dom } F \neq \emptyset$ . The limiting construction

$$\text{Limsup}_{x \rightarrow \bar{x}} F(x) := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \exists x_k \rightarrow \bar{x}, y_k \rightarrow y \text{ with } y_k \in F(x_k) \right\}$$

is known as the *Painlevé–Kuratowski outer/upper limit* of  $F$  at  $\bar{x}$ .

**Definition 2.1** (See [15, 16]). Let  $S$  be a nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\bar{x} \in S$ .

(i) The *regular/Fréchet normal cone* to  $S$  at  $\bar{x}$  is defined by

$$\widehat{N}(\bar{x}, S) = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \limsup_{x \xrightarrow{S} \bar{x}} \frac{\langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \leq 0 \right\},$$

where  $x \xrightarrow{S} \bar{x}$  means that  $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$  and  $x \in S$ .

(ii) The *limiting/Mordukhovich normal cone* to  $S$  at  $\bar{x}$  is given by

$$N(\bar{x}, S) = \text{Limsup}_{x \xrightarrow{S} \bar{x}} \widehat{N}(x, S).$$

We set  $\widehat{N}(\bar{x}, S) = N(\bar{x}, S) = \emptyset$  if  $\bar{x} \notin S$ .

Clearly, one always has

$$\widehat{N}(x, S) \subseteq N(x, S), \quad \forall x \in S.$$

Given a function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , its *effective domain* is

$$\text{dom } \varphi := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \varphi(x) < +\infty\}$$

and its *epigraph* is

$$\text{epi } \varphi := \{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha \geq \varphi(x)\}.$$

We call  $\varphi$  a *proper function* if its  $\text{dom } \varphi$  is a nonempty set.

**Definition 2.2** (See [15, 16]). Consider a function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  and a point  $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } \varphi$ .

(i) The *regular/Fréchet subdifferential* of  $\varphi$  at  $\bar{x}$  is

$$\widehat{\partial}\varphi(\bar{x}) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (v, -1) \in \widehat{N}_{\text{epi } \varphi}(\bar{x}, \varphi(\bar{x}))\}.$$

(ii) The *limiting/Mordukhovich subdifferential* of  $\varphi$  at  $\bar{x}$  is

$$\partial\varphi(\bar{x}) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (v, -1) \in N_{\text{epi } \varphi}(\bar{x}, \varphi(\bar{x}))\}$$

and the *limiting/Mordukhovich singular subdifferential* of  $f$  at  $\bar{x}$  is

$$\partial^\infty\varphi(\bar{x}) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists v_k \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi(\bar{x}), \lambda_k \downarrow 0, \lambda_k v_k \rightarrow v\}.$$

It is well known that

$$\partial\varphi(\bar{x}) = \text{Limsup}_{x \xrightarrow{\varphi} \bar{x}} \widehat{\partial}\varphi(x) \supseteq \widehat{\partial}\varphi(\bar{x}),$$

where  $x \xrightarrow{\varphi} \bar{x}$  means that  $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$  and  $\varphi(x) \rightarrow \varphi(\bar{x})$ . In particular, if  $\varphi$  is a convex function, then the subdifferentials  $\widehat{\partial}\varphi(\bar{x})$  and  $\partial\varphi(\bar{x})$  coincide with the subdifferential in the sense of convex analysis.

For the singular subdifferential, we have

$$\partial^\infty\varphi(\bar{x}) \subseteq \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (v, 0) \in N_{\text{epi } \varphi}(\bar{x}, \varphi(\bar{x}))\},$$

see, for example, [20]. This relationship holds with equality whenever  $\varphi$  is lower semicontinuous (l.s.c.) at  $\bar{x}$ .

Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ . We define the *indicator function*  $\delta_S: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  by

$$\delta_S(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in S, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It holds that, for any  $x \in S$ ,  $\partial\delta_S(x) = \partial^\infty\delta_S(x) = N_S(x)$ .

Some calculus rules for the limiting/Mordukhovich and singular subdifferentials used later are collected in the following lemmas (see [15, 16, 20]).

**Lemma 2.3 (Fermat rule, see [15, Proposition 1.114]).** *If a proper function  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$  has a local minimum at  $\bar{x}$ , then  $0 \in \widehat{\partial}\varphi(\bar{x}) \subseteq \partial\varphi(\bar{x})$ .*

**Lemma 2.4 (See [16, Theorem 4.10]).** *Let  $\varphi_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$  with  $m \geq 2$ , be Lipschitz around  $\bar{x}$ . Then the subdifferential of maximum function holds*

$$\partial(\max \varphi_i)(\bar{x}) \subseteq \left\{ \sum_{i \in I(\bar{x})} \lambda_i \partial\varphi_i(\bar{x}) \mid \lambda_i \geq 0, \sum_{i \in I(\bar{x})} \lambda_i = 1 \right\},$$

where  $I(\bar{x}) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid \varphi_i(\bar{x}) = (\max \varphi_i)(\bar{x})\}$ .

### 3. Optimality conditions

In this section, we derive and analyze necessary and sufficient conditions for the multiobjective optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in S} F(x), \tag{MP}$$

where  $S$  is a nonempty closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a vector-valued function with  $F := (F_1, \dots, F_m)^\top$ , and, for each  $i \in I := \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,

$$F_i = f_i + g_i - h_i,$$

where  $f_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is locally Lipschitz,  $g_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is differentiable with an  $\ell$ -Lipschitz continuous gradient, and  $h_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\beta$ -weakly convex, each satisfying its respective property on an open set containing  $S$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\bar{x} \in S$ . We say that

- (i)  $\bar{x}$  is a local weak Pareto solution of (MP) if there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that there is no  $x \in S \cap U$  satisfying

$$F(x) \in F(\bar{x}) - \text{int } \mathbb{R}_+^m. \tag{1}$$

- (ii)  $\bar{x}$  is a (global) weak Pareto solution of (MP) if there is no  $x \in S$  satisfying (1).

**Remark 3.2.** By definition, it is easy to see that a point  $\bar{x} \in S$  is a (local) weak Pareto solution of (MP) iff  $\bar{x}$  is a (local) solution of the following minimax programming problem

$$\min_{x \in S} \max_{i \in I} (F_i(x) - F_i(\bar{x})).$$

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $\bar{x} \in S$ . We say that

(i)  $\bar{x}$  is a *stationary point* of (MP) if there exists  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$0 \in \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (\partial f_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla g_i(\bar{x}) - \partial h_i(\bar{x})) + N_S(\bar{x}).$$

(ii)  $\bar{x}$  is a *strong stationary point* of (MP) if there exists  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \partial h_i(\bar{x}) \subseteq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (\partial f_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla g_i(\bar{x})) + N_S(\bar{x}).$$

**Remark 3.4.** Clearly, every strong stationary point of (MP) is also a stationary one. The reverse does not hold even for the scalar case; see, e.g., [1, p. 133]. However, it is easy to see that if the functions  $h_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , are differentiable at  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{x}$  is a stationary point of (MP), then it is also a strong stationary point of (MP).

**Theorem 3.5 (Necessary optimality condition).** *Suppose that, for each  $i \in I$ , restricted to an open set containing  $S$ ,  $f_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is locally Lipschitz,  $g_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  is continuously differentiable, and  $h_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\beta$ -weakly convex. If  $\bar{x}$  be a local weak Pareto solution of (MP), then it is a stationary point of (MP).*

*Proof.* For each  $i \in I$ , let  $u_i \in \partial h_i(\bar{x})$  and let  $\varphi_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be defined by

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \varphi_i(x) := f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x}) + g_i(x) - g_i(\bar{x}) - \langle u_i, x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2.$$

Then, for all  $i \in I$ ,  $\varphi_i(\bar{x}) = 0$ . Next, let  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$  be defined by

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \varphi(x) := \max_{i \in I} \varphi_i(x).$$

We claim that  $\bar{x}$  is a local solution of the problem

$$\min_{x \in S} \varphi(x). \tag{2}$$

By Remark 3.2 and the fact that  $\bar{x}$  is a local weak Pareto solution of (MP), there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that

$$\forall x \in S \cap U, \quad \max_{i \in I} (F_i(x) - F_i(\bar{x})) \geq 0.$$

This means that, for each  $x \in S \cap U$ , there exists  $i_0 \in I$  such that  $F_{i_0}(x) - F_{i_0}(\bar{x}) \geq 0$ , or equivalently,

$$f_{i_0}(x) - f_{i_0}(\bar{x}) + g_{i_0}(x) - g_{i_0}(\bar{x}) - (h_{i_0}(x) - h_{i_0}(\bar{x})) \geq 0.$$

Since  $u_{i_0} \in \partial h_{i_0}(\bar{x})$ , one has

$$h_{i_0}(x) - h_{i_0}(\bar{x}) + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \geq \langle u_{i_0}, x - \bar{x} \rangle.$$

Hence,

$$\varphi_{i_0}(x) = f_{i_0}(x) - f_{i_0}(\bar{x}) + g_{i_0}(x) - g_{i_0}(\bar{x}) - \langle u_{i_0}, x - \bar{x} \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x - \bar{x}\|^2$$

$$\geq f_{i_0}(x) - f_{i_0}(\bar{x}) + g_{i_0}(x) - g_{i_0}(\bar{x}) - (h_{i_0}(x) - h_{i_0}(\bar{x})) \geq 0.$$

This implies that, for all  $x \in S \cap U$ ,  $\varphi(x) = \max_{i \in I} \varphi_i(x) \geq 0$ . Thus,  $\bar{x}$  is a local solution of (2). By Lemma 2.3, one has

$$0 \in \partial(\varphi + \delta_S)(\bar{x}).$$

By assumptions, it is clear that  $\varphi$  is locally Lipschitz and hence

$$0 \in \partial\varphi(\bar{x}) + N_S(\bar{x}).$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.4, there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  such that  $\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \partial\varphi_i(\bar{x}) + N_S(\bar{x}) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (\partial f_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla g_i(\bar{x})) - \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i u_i + N_S(\bar{x}) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (\partial f_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla g_i(\bar{x}) - \partial h_i(\bar{x})) + N_S(\bar{x}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. ■

**Remark 3.6.** In [12, Theorem 2.1] (see also [19, Theorem 3.1]), it is claimed that if, for each  $i \in I$ ,  $f_i$  and  $h_i$  are convex,  $g_i \equiv 0$ , the constraint set  $S$  is convex, and  $\bar{x}$  is a local weak Pareto solution of (MP), then  $\bar{x}$  is a strong stationary point of (MP). However, the following example shows that this assertion does not hold.

**Example 3.7.** Let us consider problem (MP) in the case where  $S = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $m = 2$ , and, for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $g_i \equiv 0$ , while  $f_i$  and  $h_i$  are convex functions defined by

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad f_1(x) = |x|, \quad f_2(x) = 2x, \quad h_1(x) = |x| + x, \quad h_2(x) = |x|.$$

Then  $F_1(x) = -x$  and  $F_2(x) = 2x - |x|$ . Let  $\bar{x} = 0$ . We claim that  $\bar{x}$  is a weak Pareto solution of (MP). Indeed, one has

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \max\{F_1(x), F_2(x)\} = \max\{-x, 2x - |x|\} \geq 0,$$

as required. By Theorem 3.5,  $\bar{x}$  is a stationary point of (MP). We now show that  $\bar{x}$  is not a strong stationary point of (MP). If otherwise, then there exist  $\lambda_1 \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda_2 \geq 0$  such that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$  and

$$\lambda_1 \partial h_1(\bar{x}) + \lambda_2 \partial h_2(\bar{x}) \subseteq \lambda_1 \partial f_1(\bar{x}) + \lambda_2 \partial f_2(\bar{x}). \quad (3)$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial f_1(\bar{x}) &= [-1, 1], \quad \partial f_2(\bar{x}) = \{2\}, \\ \partial h_1(\bar{x}) &= [0, 2], \quad \text{and} \quad \partial h_2(\bar{x}) = [-1, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (3) means that

$$\lambda_1[0, 2] + \lambda_2[-1, 1] \subseteq \lambda_1[-1, 1] + \lambda_2 \cdot 2,$$

or, equivalently,

$$[-\lambda_2, 2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2] \subseteq [-\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2, \lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2].$$

Thus,

$$\begin{cases} -\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 \leq -\lambda_2, \\ 2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2, \\ \lambda_1 \geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1. \end{cases}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}, \\ \lambda_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases}$$

a contradiction.

The following result gives a sufficient condition for a strong stationary point of (MP) to be a local weak Pareto solution of (MP).

**Theorem 3.8 (Sufficient optimality condition, type I; see [7, Corollary 3.4]).** *Suppose that, for each  $i \in I$ ,  $f_i$  and  $g_i$  are convex, and  $h_i$  is polyhedral convex. If  $\bar{x} \in S$  is a strong stationary point of (MP), then  $\bar{x}$  is a local weak Pareto solution of (MP).*

**Remark 3.9.** It follows from Example 3.7 that the converse conclusion of Theorem 3.8 does not hold even for the case where the functions  $f_i$  and  $h_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , are polyhedral convex.

We next introduce a class of functions that guarantees that every strong stationary of (MP) is a local Pareto solution.

**Definition 3.10.** We say that  $(f, g, h)$  is *locally generalized convex-concave* on  $S$  at  $\bar{x} \in S$  if there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that, for any  $x \in U \cap S$ ,  $u_i \in \partial f_i(\bar{x})$ , and  $v_i \in \partial h_i(\bar{x})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , there exists  $\nu \in T_S(\bar{x})$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x}) &\geq \langle u_i, \nu \rangle, \quad i \in I, \\ g_i(x) - g_i(\bar{x}) &\geq \langle \nabla g_i(\bar{x}), \nu \rangle, \quad i \in I, \\ h_i(\bar{x}) - h_i(x) &\geq \langle -v_i, \nu \rangle, \quad i \in I. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 3.11.** Let  $\bar{x} \in S$ . It is easy to see that if  $f_i$  and  $g_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , are convex and there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that

$$h_i(x) = \langle a_i, x \rangle + b_i, \quad \forall x \in U \cap S, i \in I,$$

then  $(f, g, h)$  is locally generalized convex-concave on  $S$  at  $\bar{x}$  with respect to  $\nu = x - \bar{x}$ .

The following result gives a sufficient condition for a stationary point of (MP) to be a local weak Pareto solution.

**Theorem 3.12 (Sufficient optimality condition, type II).** *Suppose that  $(f, g, h)$  is locally generalized convex-concave on  $S$  at  $\bar{x} \in S$ . If  $\bar{x}$  is a stationary point of (MP), then it is a local weak Pareto solution of (MP).*

*Proof.* Since  $\bar{x}$  is a stationary point of (MP), there exist  $\lambda_i \geq 0$ ,  $i \in I$ , such that  $\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i = 1$  and

$$0 \in \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i [\partial f_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla g_i(\bar{x}) - \partial h_i(\bar{x})] + N_S(\bar{x}).$$

Hence, there are  $u_i \in \partial f_i(\bar{x})$ ,  $v_i \in \partial h_i(\bar{x})$ , and  $w \in N_S(\bar{x})$  such that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (u_i + \nabla g_i(\bar{x}) - v_i) = -w. \quad (4)$$

Since  $(f, g, h)$  is generalized convex on  $S$  at  $\bar{x}$ , there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\bar{x}$  such that for any  $x \in U \cap S$ , we find  $\nu \in T_S(\bar{x})$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(x) - f_i(\bar{x}) &\geq \langle u_i, \nu \rangle, \quad i \in I, \\ g_i(x) - g_i(\bar{x}) &\geq \langle \nabla g_i(\bar{x}), \nu \rangle, \quad i \in I, \\ h_i(\bar{x}) - h_i(x) &\geq \langle -v_i, \nu \rangle, \quad i \in I. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequalities together with (4) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i [f_i(x) + g_i(x) - h_i(x)] - \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i [f_i(\bar{x}) + g_i(\bar{x}) - h_i(\bar{x})] \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i [\langle u_i, \nu \rangle + \langle \nabla g_i(\bar{x}), \nu \rangle - \langle v_i, \nu \rangle] \\ &= \langle -w, \nu \rangle \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i [F_i(x) - F_i(\bar{x})] \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

This and the fact that  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  and  $\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i = 1$  imply that

$$\max_{i \in I} (F_i(x) - F_i(\bar{x})) \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

Hence,  $\bar{x}$  is a local weak Pareto solution of (MP). ■

## 4. Proposed Algorithm

In this section, we propose and analyze the following algorithm for solving (MP), which exploits the DC-type structure of the objective functions.

### Algorithm 1.

▷ **Step 1.** Let  $x^0 \in S$  and  $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, \frac{1}{\ell + \beta})$ . Set  $k = 0$ .

▷ **Step 2.** For each  $i \in I$ , let  $u_i^k \in \partial h_i(x^k)$ . Let  $\gamma_k \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$  and find

$$x^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in S} \left( \max_{i \in I} \left( f_i(x) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, x - x^k \rangle \right) + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x - x^k\|^2 \right).$$

▷ **Step 3.** If a termination criterion is not met, set  $k = k + 1$  and go to Step 2.

**Remark 4.1.** In the case when all  $h_i \equiv 0$ , Step 2 of Algorithm 1 reduces to

$$x^{k+1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in S} \left( \max_{i \in I} \left( f_i(x) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k), x - x^k \rangle \right) + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x - x^k\|^2 \right).$$

In general, Step 2 requires solving a subproblem of a max structure that admits several equivalent reformulations, which can be exploited for numerical solution.



- (i) (*Epigraph reformulation*) Introducing an auxiliary scalar variable  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the subproblem can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in S, t \in \mathbb{R}} \quad & t + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x - x^k\|^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & f_i(x) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, x - x^k \rangle \leq t, \quad i \in I. \end{aligned}$$

This formulation separates the pointwise maximum from the quadratic regularization term and reduces Step 2 to a single-objective constrained optimization problem. From an implementation viewpoint, the latter can be handled using standard nonlinear optimization techniques.

- (ii) (*Simplex-weight representation*) Using the identity

$$\max_{i \in I} a_i = \max_{\lambda \in \Delta} \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i a_i, \quad \Delta := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m : \lambda_i \geq 0, \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i = 1\},$$

the subproblem admits the equivalent formulation

$$\min_{x \in S} \max_{\lambda \in \Delta} \left( \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (f_i(x) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, x - x^k \rangle) + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x - x^k\|^2 \right).$$

This representation shows that Step 2 can be interpreted as computing a proximal-type step associated with a weighted aggregation of the objective variations, where the weights  $\lambda_i$  are chosen from the simplex. In practice, this viewpoint connects Step 2 with classical scalarization techniques in multiobjective optimization and provides additional flexibility for algorithmic design.

We now establish the main convergence properties of Algorithm 1, including descent estimates, boundedness of the generated sequence, and stationarity of its cluster points.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *For all  $i \in I$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$F_i(x^{k+1}) + \left( \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} - \frac{\ell + \beta}{2} \right) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq F_i(x^k).$$

- (ii) *If there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $F_i$  is bounded from below on  $S$ , then*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 < +\infty$$

*and consequently,  $x^{k+1} - x^k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ .*

- (iii) *If there exists  $i \in I$  such that the set  $\{x \in S : F_i(x) \leq F_i(x^0)\}$  is bounded, then the sequence  $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded.*

- (iv) *If  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \gamma_k > 0$  and there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $F_i$  is bounded from below on  $S$ , then every cluster point of the sequence  $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a stationary point of (MP).*

*Proof.* (i): We first see that, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x^k \in S$ . Let  $i \in I$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . It follows from Step 2 of Algorithm 1 that, for all  $x \in S$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & f_i(x^{k+1}) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ & \leq \max_{i \in I} \left( f_i(x^{k+1}) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle \right) + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \\ & \leq \max_{i \in I} \left( f_i(x) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, x - x^k \rangle \right) + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x - x^k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $x = x^k$  yields

$$f_i(x^{k+1}) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq 0. \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, we have from the Lipschitz continuity of  $\nabla g_i$  and [17, Lemma 1.2.3] that

$$g_i(x^{k+1}) - g_i(x^k) \leq \langle \nabla g_i(x^k), x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{\ell}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2,$$

and from the weak convexity of  $h_i$  that

$$-h_i(x^{k+1}) + h_i(x^k) \leq -\langle u_i^k, x^{k+1} - x^k \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2.$$

Combining with (7), we obtain that

$$f_i(x^{k+1}) - f_i(x^k) + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 + g_i(x^{k+1}) - g_i(x^k) - h_i(x^{k+1}) + h_i(x^k) \leq \frac{\ell + \beta}{2} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2,$$

or equivalently,

$$F_i(x^{k+1}) + \left( \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} - \frac{\ell + \beta}{2} \right) \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq F_i(x^k).$$

(ii): Assume that there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $F_i$  is bounded from below on  $S$ . By combining with (i), the sequence  $(F_i(x^k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is nonincreasing and bounded from below, so it is convergent. Now, telescoping the inequality in (i) and noting that, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma_k \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ , we obtain

$$\left( \frac{1}{2\bar{\gamma}} - \frac{\ell + \beta}{2} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 \leq F_i(x^0) - \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F_i(x^{n+1}) < +\infty.$$

Since  $\bar{\gamma} \in \left(0, \frac{1}{\ell + \beta}\right)$ , it follows that  $\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|^2 < +\infty$ , and hence  $x^{k+1} - x^k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ .

(iii): Assume that there exists  $i \in I$  such that the set  $S_0 := \{x \in S : F_i(x) \leq F_i(x^0)\}$  is bounded. We derive from (i) that, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $F_i(x^k) \leq F_i(x^0)$ , and so  $x^k \in S_0$ . The conclusion then follows.

(iv): Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We have from the optimality condition for the  $x$ -update that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & \in \partial \left( \max_{i \in I} \left( f_i(\cdot) - f_i(x^k) + \langle \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k, \cdot - x^k \rangle \right) + \frac{1}{2\gamma_k} \|\cdot - x^k\|^2 + \delta_S(\cdot) \right) (x^{k+1}) \\ & \subseteq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i^k \left( \partial f_i(x^{k+1}) + \nabla g_i(x^k) - u_i^k \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma_k} (x^{k+1} - x^k) + N_S(x^{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\lambda_1^k, \dots, \lambda_m^k \in [0, +\infty)$  summing up to 1.

Let  $\bar{x}$  be a cluster point of the sequence  $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $(x^{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $x^{n_k} \rightarrow \bar{x}$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ . Since  $h_i$  is a continuous convex function,  $\partial h_i$  is locally bounded around  $\bar{x}$ , and so  $(u_i^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded. By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that, for each  $i \in I$ ,  $u_i^{n_k} \rightarrow \bar{u}_i$  and  $\lambda_i^{n_k} \rightarrow \lambda_i \in [0, +\infty)$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ . Clearly,  $\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i = 1$  and by the robustness of the convex subdifferential, one has  $\bar{u}_i \in \partial h_i(\bar{x})$ . By (ii),  $x^{n_k+1} \rightarrow \bar{x}$ . Replacing  $k$  in (8) by  $n_k$ , letting  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ , and using the robustness property of  $\partial f_i$  and the continuity of  $\nabla g_i$ , we derive that

$$0 \in \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (\partial f_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla g_i(\bar{x}) - \bar{u}_i) + N_S(\bar{x}) \subseteq \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i (\partial f_i(\bar{x}) + \nabla g_i(\bar{x}) - \partial h_i(\bar{x})) + N_S(\bar{x}),$$

which completes the proof. ■

## 5. Conclusion

We have established necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for a broad class of constrained multiobjective optimization problems, where each objective function is the difference between a proper lower semicontinuous function and a convex function. Based on these conditions, we have proposed a proximal subgradient algorithm that specifically utilizes the problem structures. Theoretical analysis shows that, under mild assumptions, the sequence generated by the algorithm is bounded, and all cluster points are critical solutions.

Our work provides a solid theoretical framework for tackling constrained multiobjective DC optimization problems and introduces a practical algorithm that exploits the structure of the objectives. Future research could explore extensions of this approach to incorporate additional problem-specific structures, such as stochastic or dynamic components, and further investigate its application to real-world problems.

## Acknowledgements

Part of this work was done during the authors' visit to the Vietnam Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics (VIASM) in 2024. The authors would like to thank VIASM for their financial support and hospitality. MND is partially supported by the Australian Research Council Discovery Project DP230101749.

## References

- [1] An, N.T., Nam, N.M.: Convergence analysis of a proximal point algorithm for minimizing differences of functions. *Optimization* 69, 129–147 (2017)
- [2] Bomze, I.M., Lemarechal, C.: Necessary conditions for local optimality in difference-of-convex programming. *Journal of Convex Analysis* 17(2), 673–680 (2010)
- [3] Boufi, K., El Haffari, M., Roubi, A.: Optimality conditions and a method of centers for minimax fractional programs with difference of convex functions. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 187, 105–132 (2020)

- [4] Collette, Y., Siarry, P.: *Multiobjective Optimization: Principles and Case Studies* (Decision Engineering). Springer, New York (2011)
- [5] de Oliveira, W.: The ABC of DC programming. *Set-Valued Var. Anal.* 28, 679–706 (2020)
- [6] Ehrgott, M.: *Multicriteria Optimization*. Springer, Berlin (2005)
- [7] Gadhi, N., Metrane, A.: Sufficient optimality condition for vector optimization problems under DC data. *J. Glob. Optim.* 28, 55–66 (2004)
- [8] Hang, N.T.V., Yen, N.D.: On the problem of minimizing a difference of polyhedral convex functions under linear constraints. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 171, 617–642 (2016)
- [9] Hiriart-Urruty, J., Ponstein, J.: Generalized differentiability/duality and optimization for problems dealing with differences of convex functions. In: *Convexity and Duality in Optimization: Proceedings of the Symposium on Convexity and Duality in Optimization Held at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands June 22, 1984*, pp. 37–70. Springer, Berlin (1985)
- [10] Huong, V.T., Huyen, D.T.K., Yen, N.D.: Generalized polyhedral DC optimization problems. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 207, 11 (2025)
- [11] Jahn, J.: *Vector Optimization: Theory, Applications, and Extensions*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (2011)
- [12] Ji, Y., Goh, M., de Souza, R.: Proximal point algorithms for multi-criteria optimization with the difference of convex objective functions. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 169, 280–289 (2016)
- [13] Le Thi, H.A., Tao, P.D.: DC programming and DCA: thirty years of developments. *Math. Program.* 169(1), 5–68 (2018)
- [14] Luc, D.T.: *Theory of Vector Optimization*. Springer, Berlin (1989)
- [15] Mordukhovich, B.S.: *Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation, I: Basic Theory; II: Applications*. Springer, Berlin (2006)
- [16] Mordukhovich, B.S.: *Variational Analysis and Applications*. Springer, New York (2018)
- [17] Nesterov, Y.: *Lectures on Convex Optimization*. Springer, Cham (2018)
- [18] Pham, D.T., Le Thi, H.A.: Convex analysis approach to DC programming: theory, algorithms and applications. *Acta Math. Vietnam* 22(1), 289–355 (1997)
- [19] Qu, S.J., Goh, M., Wu, S.Y., Souza, R.D.: Multiobjective DC programs with infinite convex constraints. *J. Glob. Optim.* 59, 41–58 (2013)
- [20] Rockafellar, R.T., Wets, R.J.-B.: *Variational Analysis*. Springer, Berlin (1998)
- [21] Sawaragi, Y., Nakayam, H., Tanino, T.: *Theory of Multiobjective Optimization*. Academic Press, Orlando (1985)
- [22] Toland, J.F.: Duality in nonconvex optimization. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 66, 399–415 (1978)