

An algorithm for best generalised rational approximation of continuous functions

R. Díaz Millán · Nadezda Sukhorukova · Julien Ugon

Abstract The motivation of this paper is the development of an optimisation method for solving optimisation problems appearing in Chebyshev rational and generalised rational approximation problems, where the approximations are constructed as ratios of linear forms (linear combinations of basis functions). The coefficients of the linear forms are subject to optimisation and the basis functions are continuous function. It is known that the objective functions in generalised rational approximation problems are quasi-convex. In this paper we also prove a stronger result, the objective functions are pseudo-convex in the sense of Penot and Quang. Then we develop numerical methods, that are efficient for a wide range of pseudo-convex functions and test them on generalised rational approximation problems.

Keywords Chebyshev generalised rational approximation, pseudo-convex functions, point-to-set operators.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 90C25 · 90C26 · 90C90 · 90C47 · 65D15 · 65K10

1 Introduction

Consider the set of all real-valued polynomials with degree up to n , denoted by Π_n , and the continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We are interested in the problem of approximating the function f by a rational function $\frac{p}{q}$ where $p \in \Pi_n$ and $q \in \Pi_m$ for some given nonnegative numbers $n \geq 0$ and $m \geq 0$. In others words we want

R. Díaz Millán
School of Information Technology, Deakin University, Geelong, Australia, E-mail: r.diazmillan@deakin.edu.au.

Nadezda Sukhorukova
Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, Australia, E-mail: nsukhorukova@swin.edu.au.

Julien Ugon
School of Information Technology, Deakin University, Geelong, Australia, E-mail: julien.ugon@deakin.edu.au.

to solve the optimisation problem:

$$\min_{p \in \Pi_n, q \in \Pi_m} \sup_{t \in I} \left| f(t) - \frac{p(t)}{q(t)} \right|. \quad (1)$$

Problem (1) is also known as Chebyshev rational approximation problem. We represent the polynomial $p \in \Pi_n$ by an element in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} by

$$p(t) = \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{t}_n \rangle = a_0 + a_1 t + a_2 t^2 \cdots + a_n t^n,$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ are the coefficient of the polynomial, and the vector the vector $\mathbf{t}_n = (1, t, t^2, \dots, t^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ for each $t \in I$, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ being any compact subset of \mathbb{R} . Now Problem (1) can be written as:

$$\min_{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in C} \Psi_{II}^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \quad (2)$$

where $\Psi_{II}^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \sup_{t \in I} \left| f(t) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{t}_n \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}_m \rangle} \right|$ is a maximal deviation for the approximation of f on the interval I , and

$$C = \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{t}_m \rangle \geq 1, \forall t \in I\}$$

is a feasible set.

Rational approximation was a popular research topic in 50s-60s of the twentieth century [1,8,13,14] as a promising alternative to the free knot spline approximation. Rational approximation models combine simplicity and significant flexibility, two properties attractive for practical applications [5,11].

In [9] Cheney and Loeb demonstrated that some of the results in the area of Chebyshev rational approximation can be extended to approximation by a ratio of linear forms

$$\frac{G(\mathbf{a}, t)}{H(\mathbf{b}, t)} = \frac{a_0 g_0(t) + a_1 g_1(t) + a_2 g_2(t) \cdots + a_n g_n(t)}{b_0 h_0(t) + b_1 h_1(t) + b_2 h_2(t) \cdots + b_m h_m(t)} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle}, \quad (3)$$

where $g_i(t)$, $i = 0, \dots, n$ and $h_j(t)$, $j = 0, \dots, m$ are not limited to monomials. The authors call this type of approximation *generalised rational approximation*. There are a number of ways to generalise rational approximations. In the current paper we use the same terminology as in [9] and therefore we approximate continuous functions by the ratios of linear forms and the coefficients of these forms are subject to optimisation. It is still required for the linear form in the denominator to be positive.

These extensions of the results are possible due to the fact that the corresponding objective functions in the optimisation problems are quasi-convex. We will talk about this property in Section 2. In this paper we also prove a stronger result, the objective functions are pseudo-convex in the sense of Penot and Quang (which extends the notion of pseudo-convexity to the case of nonsmooth functions, see [2,10,12]). Then we develop numerical methods, that are efficient for a wide range of pseudo-convex functions and test them on generalised rational approximation problems.

In the case of generalised rational approximation, the optimisation problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} \sup_{t \in I} \left| f(t) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \right|, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the decision variables and also the coefficients of the linear forms, $g_i(t)$, $i = 0, \dots, n$ and $h_j(t)$, $j = 0, \dots, m$ are called the basis functions, $t \in I$, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ any compact subset of \mathbb{R} . This can be written as:

$$\min_{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in C} \Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), \quad (5)$$

where $\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \sup_{t \in I} \left| f(t) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \right|$ is a maximal deviation for the approximation of f on the interval I , and

$$C = \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle \geq 1, \forall t \in I\}$$

is the feasible set.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce notation and preliminaries. In Section 3 we introduce essential results related to the approximation problem. Section 4 is dedicated to developing an algorithm for solving a variational inequality which is equivalent to solve the approximation problem. In Section 5 we present a general algorithm to solve non-monotone variational inequalities for point-to-set operators. Section 6 shows some numerical experiments to demonstrate the behaviour of the presented algorithm. Some conclusion remarks are presented in Section 7.

2 Preliminary results

This section is devoted to some classic notation, definition and results we will use along to the present work.

By \mathbb{R}^n we denote the n dimensional Euclidean space, $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value function, $\|\cdot\|$ the norm induced by the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. The set $\text{conv}D$ is the convex hull of the set D . The orthogonal projection of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, onto the convex, closed and non-empty set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, is defined by the unique point in C , which is the solution of the minimal distance problem:

$$P_C(x) = \underset{y \in C}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|x - y\|.$$

Given a point-to-set the operator $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$, the graph of T , is denoted and defined by $Gr(T) := \{(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n : u \in T(x)\}$.

Fact 1 Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be closed, convex and non-empty. For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $z \in C$, the following holds:

1. $\|P_C(x) - P_C(y)\|^2 \leq \|x - y\|^2 - \|(x - P_C(x)) - (y - P_C(y))\|^2$.
2. $\langle x - P_C(x), z - P_C(x) \rangle \leq 0$.

Proof See [3, Proposition 4.8 and Theorem 3.14].

One of the most useful tools in projection algorithms is the *Fejér convergence*, defined by:

Definition 1 (Fejér convergence) Let S be a nonempty subset of \mathbb{R}^n . A sequence $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be Fejér convergent to S , if and only if, for all $x \in S$ there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|x^{k+1} - x\| \leq \|x^k - x\|$ for all $k \geq k_0$.

The main properties that a Fejér convergent sequences satisfy are:

Proposition 1 *If $(x^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Fejér convergent to S , then it is bounded.*

Proof By definition, taking $\bar{x} \in S$, we have $\|x^k - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x^n - \bar{x}\|$ for any $n \leq k$, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|x^k - \bar{x}\| \leq \|x^{k_0} - \bar{x}\|$.

The concepts of monotonicity, pseudo-monotonicity and quasi-monotonicity are mentioned in this work. Now, we define these operators.

Definition 2 A point-to-set operator $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ is called:

(i) *Monotone*, if and only if, for all $(x, u), (y, v) \in Gr(T)$,

$$\langle u - v, x - y \rangle \geq 0.$$

(ii) *Pseudo-monotone*, if and only if, for all $(x, u), (y, v) \in Gr(T)$, the following implication holds:

$$\langle u, y - x \rangle \geq 0 \implies \langle v, y - x \rangle \geq 0.$$

(iii) *Quasi-monotone*, if and only if, for all $(x, u), (y, v) \in Gr(T)$, the following implication holds:

$$\langle u, y - x \rangle > 0 \implies \langle v, y - x \rangle \geq 0.$$

It is clear that every monotone operator is pseudo-monotone, and every pseudo-monotone operator is quasi-monotone.

3 Approximation of continuous functions

This section is dedicated to analysing Problem (2).

Lemma 1 *For any real function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a compact set $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, the maximal deviation $\Psi^f : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a quasi-convex function.*

Proof For any $t \in I$ the function $f(t) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}(t) &= (g_0(t), g_1(t), \dots, g_n(t)), \\ \mathbf{h}(t) &= (h_0(t), h_1(t), \dots, h_m(t)), \end{aligned}$$

$\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle > 0$ is a quasi-convex function, as the sum of a constant and the ratio of two linear functions [6]. Then the function Ψ^f is a quasi-convex function as a supremum of quasi-convex functions.

Interestingly, this result is a direct corollary of [9, Lemma 2], but it was not elaborated by the authors and was left unnoticed for several decades. The most reasonable explanation for this is that most efficient techniques for quasi-convex optimisation were developed much later: around 20 years after [9].

We denote by $A^+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ and $A^-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ the sets of active values, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} A^+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= \left\{ t \in I : \Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \right\} \\ A^-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= \left\{ t \in I : \Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = -\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) := f(t) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle}$.

Theorem 2 *The Clarke subdifferential of the function Ψ^f can be computed as follows:*

$$\partial\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \text{conv} \left\{ \nabla\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), -\nabla\sigma_l^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) : t \in A^+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), l \in A^-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Proof See Theorem 10.31 in [15].

In [7], the authors introduce an algorithm for solving variational inequalities, when the operator is pseudo-convex, subject to some continuity requirements. In the following example we show that the subdifferential of the function Ψ^f is not necessarily inner semi-continuous, and therefore does not satisfy the requirements from [7].

Example 1 Consider the constant function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(t) = 0$, the polynomials $p(t) = 2t^2 - 1$ and $q(t) = 1$, and the compact set $I = [-1, 1]$. Then $\mathbf{a} = (-1, 0, 2)$, $\mathbf{b} = (1)$, $A^+ = \{0\}$ and $A^- = \{-1, 1\}$. Therefore $\partial\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \text{conv}\{(1, -1, 1, -2), (-1, 0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 1, -2)\}$ corresponding to the active points $t_0 = -1$, $t_1 = 0$ and $t_2 = 1$. Now consider the sequence $(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n) = (-1, 1/n, 2, 1)$ which converges to the point $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = (-1, 0, 2, 1)$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A^+(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n) = \emptyset$ and $A^-(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n) = \{1\}$. That is:

$$\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n) = \sup_{t \in [-1, 1]} \left| -1 + \frac{t}{n} + 2t^2 \right| = 1 + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\partial\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n) = (1, 1, 1, -1 - \frac{1}{n})$, which proves that there is no sequence of elements of $\partial\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n)$ converging to $y = (-1, 0, 0, 1) \in \partial\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$. Therefore the operator $\partial\Psi^f$ is not *inner semi-continuous*.

The following Lemma is a direct consequence of the continuity of the function Ψ^f .

Lemma 2 *Consider the converging sequence $(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C$, so that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n) = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in C.$$

Taking for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ an active value $t_n \in A^+(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n) \cup A^-(\mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{b}_n)$, for any converging subsequence $(t_{k_n})_{k_n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that $\lim_{k_n \rightarrow \infty} t_{k_n} = \bar{t}$ we have that $\bar{t} \in A^+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \cup A^-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$.

Proof The existence of a convergent subsequence is due to the boundedness of the compact set I , from now on, suppose for simplicity that the sequence $(t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is convergent to a point $\bar{t} \in I$.

By continuity of f we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left| f(t_i) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{g}(t_i) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{h}(t_i) \rangle} \right| = \left| f(\bar{t}) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(\bar{t}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(\bar{t}) \rangle} \right|. \quad (7)$$

Take any $\hat{t} \in I$. For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\left| f(\hat{t}) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{g}(\hat{t}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{h}(\hat{t}) \rangle} \right| \leq \left| f(t_i) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{g}(t_i) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{h}(t_i) \rangle} \right|,$$

because all t_i are active values of Ψ^f on its respective $(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i)$. Taking limits when $i \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain, using the continuity of Ψ^f , that

$$\left| f(\hat{t}) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(\hat{t}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(\hat{t}) \rangle} \right| \leq \left| f(\bar{t}) - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(\bar{t}) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(\bar{t}) \rangle} \right|.$$

Therefore \bar{t} is an active value.

Proposition 2 *Given a continuous function f , if $0 \in \partial\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ then (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) is a global minimiser of Ψ^f .*

Proof This proof is largely based on [9].

Define by

$$s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})}{\Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})},$$

so that $s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 1$ (resp. -1) when $t \in A^-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ (resp. $t \in A^+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$).

Then, $\partial\Psi^f = \text{conv}\{s(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})\nabla\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), t \in A^+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \cup A^-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &= \frac{1}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle^2} (-g_0(t)\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle, -g_1(t)\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle, \dots, -g_n(t)\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle, \\ &\quad h_0(t)\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle, h_1(t)\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle, \dots, h_m(t)\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle^2} (\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle \mathbf{g}(t), \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle \mathbf{h}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that the point (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) is *not* the global optimiser. In this case, there is a direction $(\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}') \neq 0_{n+m+2}$ such that $\Psi^f(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}') < \Psi^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$, and $(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}') \in C$. In particular for any $t \in A^+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \cup A^-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$, $|\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}')| < |\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})|$.

From there, we can find that:

$$\begin{aligned} s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \left(f - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \right) - s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \left(f - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \right) &> 0 \\ s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \right) &> 0 \\ s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \left(\langle \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle - \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \langle \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle \right) &> 0 \\ s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) (-\langle \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle + \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \langle \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle) &> 0 \\ \frac{s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle} \left(-\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle \langle \mathbf{a}', \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle + \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle \langle \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle \right) &> 0 \\ \frac{s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})}{\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle^2} \left(\langle \mathbf{a}', -\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle + \langle \mathbf{b}', \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}(t) \rangle \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle \right) &> 0 \\ \left\langle (\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}'), s_t(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \nabla\sigma_t^f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \right\rangle &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the above steps, multiplying and dividing the left hand sides by $\langle \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{h}(t) \rangle$ does not change the sign of the inequalities, since both of these quantities are positive.

Since this product is positive for every $t \in A^+ \cup A^-$, it is also positive for every element in $\partial^f\Psi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$. This implies that $0 \notin \partial^f\Psi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$.

Theorem 3 *The function Ψ^f is a pseudo-convex function in terms of [2, 10, 12]. Consequently the Clarke Subdifferential $\partial\Psi^f$ is a pseudomonotone operator.*

Proof Following from Lemma 1, Proposition 2 of this paper and Theorem 4.1 in [2], we have that Ψ^f is pseudo-convex. The second part is due to Proposition 2.2 in [10].

This result is especially important, since the basis functions are not restricted to monomials.

4 Variational inequality and the algorithm

In this section we develop an algorithm for solving the variation Inequality Problem defined below. With this purpose we present a version of **Algorithm F** in [4].

Consider the operator $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ and the set $C \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the variational inequality problem for T and C , denoted by $\text{VIP}(T,C)$, is defined as:

$$\text{Find } x^* \in C : \exists u^* \in T(x^*) : \langle u^*, x - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \forall x \in C. \quad (8)$$

When the operator T is a pseudomonotone operator, Problem (8) is equivalent to the dual variational inequality problem (DVIP(T,C)):

$$\text{Find } x^* \in C : \forall u \in T(x) : \langle u, x - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \forall x \in C. \quad (9)$$

We denote the solution of Problem (8) by S^* and the solution of Problem (9) by S_0 . The equivalence of the Problems (8) and (9) results in $S^* = S_0$.

Now, we present the version of the Linesearch F suitable to our problem:

Algorithm 1: LineSearch F: feasible direction

Input: $(a, b) \in C$, $\beta > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$
Set $\alpha \leftarrow 1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$.
for all $(u_a, u_b) \in \left\{ \nabla \sigma_t^f(a, b), -\nabla \sigma_l^f(a, b) : t \in A^+(a, b), l \in A^-(a, b) \right\}$
 define $(z_a, z_b) = P_C((a, b) - \beta(u_a, u_b))$
 if for each (u_a, u_b) we have

$$\max_{(u_a^\alpha, u_b^\alpha) \in D_\alpha} \langle (u_a^\alpha, u_b^\alpha), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle < \delta \langle (u_a, u_b), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle,$$

 where

$$D_\alpha := \left\{ \nabla \sigma_t^f(a_\alpha, b_\alpha), -\nabla \sigma_l^f(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) : t \in A^+(a_\alpha, b_\alpha), l \in A^-(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) \right\}$$

 and
 $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) = \alpha(z_a, z_b) + (1 - \alpha)(a, b)$, **then**
 | $\alpha \leftarrow \theta\alpha$
 else
 | Return α and (u_a, u_b)
 end
end
Output: $(\alpha, (u_a, u_b))$

Algorithm 2: Algorithm F

Input: $(\beta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [\check{\beta}, \hat{\beta}]$ such that $0 < \check{\beta} \leq \hat{\beta} < +\infty$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$.
Initialization: Take $(a^0, b^0) \in C$ and set $k \leftarrow 0$.
Step 1: Apply Algorithm 1 to compute

$$(\alpha_k, (u_a^k, u_b^k)) = \text{Linesearch F}((a^k, b^k), \beta_k, \delta),$$

Set $(z_a^k, z_b^k) = P_C((a^k, b^k) - \beta_k(u_a^k, u_b^k))$ then we have

$$\langle (u_a^{\alpha_k}, u_b^{\alpha_k}), (a^k, b^k) - (z_a^k, z_b^k) \rangle \geq \delta \langle (u_a^k, u_b^k), (a^k, b^k) - (z_a^k, z_b^k) \rangle$$

with $(\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k) = \alpha_k(z_a^k, z_b^k) + (1 - \alpha_k)(a^k, b^k)$ and $(u_a^{\alpha_k}, u_b^{\alpha_k}) \in \partial \Psi^f(\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k)$.

Step 2 (Stopping Criterion): **if** $(z_a^k, z_b^k) = (a^k, b^k)$ **or**
 $(a^k, b^k) = P_C((a^k, b^k) - (v_a^k, v_b^k))$ **with** $(v_a^k, v_b^k) \in \partial \Psi^f((a^k, b^k))$, **then stop**

Step 3: Set

$$(\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k) := \alpha_k(z_a^k, z_b^k) + (1 - \alpha_k)(a^k, b^k), \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{and } (a^{k+1}, b^{k+1}) := \mathcal{F}((a^k, b^k)); \quad (10b)$$

Step 4: **If** $(a^{k+1}, b^{k+1}) = (a^k, b^k)$, **then stop**. Otherwise, set $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to **Step 1**.

We consider three variants of this algorithm. Their main difference lies in way to compute (10b):

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \left((a^k, b^k) \right) = P_C \left(P_{H((\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k), (u_a^{\alpha_k}, u_b^{\alpha_k}))} \left((a^k, b^k) \right) \right); \quad (\text{Variant 1}) \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2 \left((a^k, b^k) \right) = P_{C \cap H((\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k), (u_a^{\alpha_k}, u_b^{\alpha_k}))} \left((a^k, b^k) \right); \quad (\text{Variant 2}) \quad (12)$$

where

$$H(x, u) := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+2} : \langle u, y - x \rangle \leq 0 \right\}. \quad (13)$$

4.1 Convergence

This section is dedicated to prove the convergence of **Algorithm F**. We first show that **Linesearch F** terminates.

Proposition 3 *If $(a, b) \in C$ is not a solution of Problem (8), **Linesearch F** terminates after finitely many iterations.*

Proof Suppose that **Linesearch F** never stops. Then, for all $\alpha \in \{1, \theta, \theta^2, \dots\}$ and $(u_a, u_b) \in \partial\Psi^f(a, b)$ we have

$$\langle (u_a^\alpha, u_b^\alpha), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle < \delta \langle (u_a, u_b), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle$$

for all $(u_a^\alpha, u_b^\alpha) \in \partial\Psi^f(a_\alpha, b_\alpha)$, with $(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) = \alpha(z_a, z_b) + (1 - \alpha)(a, b)$. Note that by the structure of the set $\partial\Psi^f(a, b)$ it is enough to verify the inequality over the points in D_α . Taking limits when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, we have that

$$(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) = \alpha(z_a, z_b) + (1 - \alpha)(a, b) \rightarrow (a, b).$$

By Lemma 2, there exists $(u_a, u_b) \in \partial\Psi^f(a, b)$ such that

$$\langle (u_a, u_b), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle \leq \delta \langle (u_a, u_b), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle. \quad (14)$$

Which implies that $(1 - \delta) \langle (u_a, u_b), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle \leq 0$ since $\delta \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \langle (u_a, u_b), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle \\ &\geq \|(a, b) - (z_a, z_b)\|^2 + \langle (z_a, z_b) - ((a, b) - (u_a, u_b)), (a, b) - (u_a, u_b) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using now Fact 1 we have that

$$\langle (z_a, z_b) - ((a, b) - (u_a, u_b)), (a, b) - (u_a, u_b) \rangle \geq 0,$$

then

$$0 \geq \langle (u_a, u_b), (a, b) - (z_a, z_b) \rangle \geq \|(a, b) - (z_a, z_b)\|^2 \geq 0,$$

which implies that $\|(a, b) - (z_a, z_b)\|^2 = 0$, then $(a, b) = (z_a, z_b)$ implying that (a, b) is a solution of Problem 8, which is a contradiction.

Proposition 4 $(a^k, b^k) \in S^*$ if and only if $(a^k, b^k) \in H \left((\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k), (u_a^{\alpha_k}, u_b^{\alpha_k}) \right)$.

Proof See Proposition 4.3 in [4].

Proposition 5 *If **Algorithm F** stops at steps 2 or 4, then it stops at the solution.*

Proof See Proposition 4.4 in [4].

4.1.1 Convergence Analysis of \mathcal{F}_1

Now we provide the convergence analysis of the **Variante** \mathcal{F}_1 . From now on, we assume that **Algorithm F** produces an infinite sequence $(a^k, b^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \not\subseteq S_*$. Due to Proposition 4.5(i) in [4] we have the Fejér convergence and consequently, the boundedness, by Proposition 1, of the sequence $(a^k, b^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Also

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle (u_a^{\alpha_k}, u_b^{\alpha_k}), (a^k, b^k) - (\bar{a}^k, \bar{b}^k) \rangle = 0. \quad (15)$$

The next theorem will be proved following the ideas of the Theorem 4.6 in [4], adapted to our point-to-set case.

Theorem 4 *The sequence $(a^k, b^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a point in S_* .*

Proof For the sake of brevity, we will not reproduce the full proof given in [4]. Instead we will specify whenever the proofs are different due to the operator, in our case being point-to-set, and point out that we consider all elements on the normal cone of C as zero.

Consider a subsequence $(i_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that all sequences involved in the algorithm be convergent, i.e., $(a^{i_k}, b^{i_k}) \rightarrow (\hat{a}, \hat{b})$, $(u_a^{\alpha_{i_k}}, u_b^{\alpha_{i_k}}) \rightarrow (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b)$ and $(z_a^{i_k}, z_b^{i_k}) \rightarrow (\hat{z}_a, \hat{z}_b)$. It is possible because all sequences are bounded.

Using (15) and the same criteria used in [4], we have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{i_k} \|(a^{i_k}, b^{i_k}) - (z_a^{i_k}, z_b^{i_k})\| = 0, \quad (16)$$

and here as in [4], we consider two cases: $\alpha_{i_k} \rightarrow \hat{\alpha} > 0$ or $\alpha_{i_k} \rightarrow 0$.

Case 1: $\lim_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_{i_k} = \hat{\alpha} > 0$. Due to Lemma 2 we have that,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (u_a^{\alpha_{i_k}}, u_b^{\alpha_{i_k}}) = (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b) \in \partial\Psi^f(\hat{a}, \hat{b}).$$

By the continuity of the projection mapping and (16), $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) = P_C \left((\hat{a}, \hat{b}) - (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b) \right)$, which implies that $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}) \in S_*$.

Case 2: $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{i_k} = 0$. Defining $\tilde{\alpha}_{i_k} = \frac{\alpha_{i_k}}{\theta}$, then $\tilde{\alpha}_{i_k} \rightarrow 0$, let $(\tilde{a}^{i_k}, \tilde{b}^{i_k}) = \tilde{\alpha}_{i_k} (z_a^{i_k}, z_b^{i_k}) + (1 - \tilde{\alpha}_{i_k})(a^{i_k}, b^{i_k})$ then $(\tilde{a}^{i_k}, \tilde{b}^{i_k}) \rightarrow (\hat{a}, \hat{b})$. Due to the **Linesearch F**, we have that for all $(\tilde{v}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{v}_b^{i_k}) \in \partial\Psi^f(\tilde{a}^{i_k}, \tilde{b}^{i_k})$ and all $(u_a^{i_k}, u_b^{i_k}) \in \partial\Psi^f(a^{i_k}, b^{i_k})$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\langle (\tilde{v}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{v}_b^{i_k}), (a^{i_k}, b^{i_k}) - (z_a^{i_k}, z_b^{i_k}) \rangle < \delta \langle (u_a^{i_k}, u_b^{i_k}), (a^{i_k}, b^{i_k}) - (z_a^{i_k}, z_b^{i_k}) \rangle. \quad (17)$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}_{i_k}$ converges to zero and following the same idea as in the proof of Lemma 2, there exist sequences $(\tilde{v}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{v}_b^{i_k}) \in \partial\Psi^f(\tilde{a}^{i_k}, \tilde{b}^{i_k})$ and $(\tilde{u}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{u}_b^{i_k}) \in \partial\Psi^f(a^{i_k}, b^{i_k})$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|(\tilde{v}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{v}_b^{i_k}) - (\tilde{u}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{u}_b^{i_k})\| = 0$. Taking a convergent subsequence, we have $(\tilde{v}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{v}_b^{i_k}) \rightarrow (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b)$ and $(\tilde{u}_a^{i_k}, \tilde{u}_b^{i_k}) \rightarrow (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b)$ as well, also $(a^{i_k}, b^{i_k}) \rightarrow (\hat{a}, \hat{b})$ and $(z_a^{i_k}, z_b^{i_k}) \rightarrow (\hat{z}_a, \hat{z}_b) = P_C \left((\hat{a}, \hat{b}) - (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b) \right)$. Then passing to the limits on equation (17) we obtain

$$\langle (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b), (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) - (\hat{z}_a, \hat{z}_b) \rangle \leq \delta \langle (\tilde{u}_a, \tilde{u}_b), (\hat{a}, \hat{b}) - (\hat{z}_a, \hat{z}_b) \rangle.$$

The above equation is the same as in (14), the proof continuous as in Proposition 3, getting that the limits of (a^{i_k}, b^{i_k}) is a solution of the problem.

Now as the sequence is Fejér convergent to the solution set, following Proposition 4.5 (i) in [4], we get the convergence to the solution set of the whole sequence.

4.1.2 Analysis convergence of \mathcal{F}_2

For the case of \mathcal{F}_2 all the proof are the same as was proved in [4].

5 General Algorithm for non-monotone Variational Inequality

The **Algorithm F** and the **Linesearch F** can be applied to more general problem. In fact, consider $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$, and the convex and closed set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. With the following conditions, the **Algorithm G** (**G** for “general”) below, is convergent.

- A1) T is closed.
- A2) T is bounded on bounded sets.
- A3) Problem (9) and (8) are equivalent. That is, $S^* = S_0$.

By closed we mean that the graph of T is closed. A2 is a classical assumption. A3 is weaker than pseudo-monotone, see examples in [7].

Following we present the general version for the **Linesearch F** and **Algorithm F**.

Algorithm 3: LineSearch G: General linesearch
<p>Input: $x \in C$, $\beta > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ Set $\alpha \leftarrow 1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$. for all $u \in T(x)$, Define $z = P_C(x - \beta u)$. if for each $u \in T(x)$</p> $\max_{u^\alpha \in T(x_\alpha)} \langle u^\alpha, x - z \rangle < \delta \langle u, x - z \rangle,$ <p> then where $x_\alpha := \alpha z + (1 - \alpha)x$, $\alpha \leftarrow \theta\alpha$ else Stop and choose $u^\alpha \in T(x_\alpha)$ such that: $\langle u^\alpha, x - z \rangle \geq \langle u, x - z \rangle$ end end Output: (α, u^α)</p>

Algorithm 4: Algorithm G
<p>Input: $(\beta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [\tilde{\beta}, \hat{\beta}]$ such that $0 < \tilde{\beta} \leq \hat{\beta} < +\infty$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Initialization: Take $(x^0) \in C$ and set $k \leftarrow 0$. Step 1: Apply Algorithm 3 to compute</p> $(\alpha_k, u^{\alpha_k}) = \text{LineSearch G}(x^k, \beta_k, \delta),$ <p>Set $z^k = P_C(x^k - \beta_k u^{\alpha_k})$ then we have</p> $\langle u^{\alpha_k}, x^k - z^k \rangle \geq \delta \langle u^k, x^k - z^k \rangle$ <p>with $u^{\alpha_k} \in T(\bar{x}^k)$ and $\bar{x}^k = \alpha_k z^k + (1 - \alpha_k)x^k$. Step 2 (Stopping Criterion): if $z^k = x^k$ or $x^k = P_C(x^k - v^k)$ with $v^k \in T(x^k)$, then stop Step 3: Set</p> $\bar{x}^k := \alpha_k z^k + (1 - \alpha_k)x^k, \tag{18a}$ <p>and $x^{k+1} := \mathcal{F}(x^k); \tag{18b}$</p> <p>Step 4: If $x^{k+1} = x^k$, then stop. Otherwise, set $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to Step 1.</p>

Two variants can be consider for computing (18b).

$$\mathcal{F}_1(x^k) = P_C \left(P_{H(\bar{x}^k, u^{\alpha_k})}(x^k) \right);$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2(x^k) = P_{C \cap H(\bar{x}^k, u^{\alpha_k})}(x^k);$$

where $u^{\alpha_k} \in T(\bar{x}^k)$ and

$$H(x, u) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle u, y - x \rangle \leq 0\}.$$

The differences between the **Algorithm G** and the **Conceptual Algorithm F** in [4] are listed below:

- We consider null normal vectors.
- We consider point-to-set operators instead of point-to-point.
- The **Linesearch G** is different to **Linesearch F**.

6 Numerical Experiment

This section is dedicated to showing some numerical experiments to demonstrate the development of the **Algorithm F** to approximate continuous functions. The section is split into two parts. The first part is dedicated to the "classical approximation" (using rational functions with polynomials) we split this section into two, first, we approximate function for which we don't know the solution sets and the compact set $I = [-1, 1]$, and after, we approximate function when we know the solution sets, which allow to measure the distance to the solution set, and considering the compact set I an equidistant points onto the interval $[-1, 1]$. In the second part, we use non-polynomial rational functions and a finite collection of equidistant points onto the interval $[-1, 1]$ as the compact set I . We compare different kinds of approximation rational functions.

6.1 Rational Approximation with Polynomial

In this subsection we consider the Problem (4) with $p \in \Pi_n$ and $q \in \Pi_m$, polynomials of degree n and m respectively.

6.1.1 Unknown solution over an interval

In these examples, we choose the best results after 200 iterations. In all cases, the interval $I = [-1, 1]$, Ψ_i^f with $i = 1, 2$ denotes the function value for the Variants 1 and 2 respectively, $iter$ is the iteration number in which was attained the best result. n, m are the degree of the numerator and denominator polynomials respectively. In the pictures below, we specified the function and the degrees in each case, in all pictures the blue color is for the Variant 1, the red color for Variant 2. The green color in figures 2,3,4 and 5, is the graph of the function f which is the function to be approximated.

Algorithm F for unknown solution					
$f(t)$	(n, m)	$Iter$	$\Psi_1^f(a, b)$	$Iter$	$\Psi_2^f(a, b)$
$ t $	(2, 2)	161	0.068	186	0.070
$ t $	(3, 3)	193	0.072	191	0.069
$ t $	(4, 3)	198	0.069	198	0.069
$\sin(t)$	(2, 2)	186	0.0097	186	0.014
$ \sin(t) $	(3, 3)	189	0.0714	193	0.0700
$\sqrt{ t }$	(4, 4)	193	0.186	185	0.182




Fig. 1: In both sides the objective function Ψ_i^f , $i = 1, 2$.




Fig. 2: **Left:** The graph of f and p/q . **Right:** Objective function Ψ_i^f , $i = 1, 2$.




Fig. 3: **Left:** The graph of f and p/q . **Right:** Objective function Ψ_i^f , $i = 1, 2$.




Fig. 4: **Left:** The graph of f and p/q . **Right:** Objective function $\Psi_i^f, i = 1, 2$.




Fig. 5: **Left:** The graph of f and p/q . **Right:** Objective function $\Psi_i^f, i = 1, 2$.

6.1.2 Known solution over discrete compact set

In this subsection we testing rational functions as the objective function. Then we know the solution sets. We denote by $iter$ the number of iterations, $d_i(x, S^*)$ denotes the distance between the last point to the solution set for the variant i . We stopped the algorithm when the function value Ψ_i^f at the current point be less or equal to 10^{-3} . For the compact set I , we used a collection of M equidistant points on the interval $[-1, 1]$.

6.2 Non-polynomial rational approximation

In this section we consider different rational function to approximate continuous functions. We denote by CPU the CPU time. By $h(t)$, we denote the functions which compose the rational function, i.e., $p(t) = \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{H}(t) \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k h^k(t)$. For this

Algorithm F for known solution						
$f(t)$	(n, m)	M	Iter	$d_1(x, S^*)$	Iter	$d_2(x, S^*)$
1	(1, 1)	100	12	$9.746 * 10^{-4}$	12	$9.87 * 10^{-4}$
1	(2, 2)	200	455	0.004	381	0.0026
$\frac{1}{t^2+1}$	(1, 2)	100	423	0.0097	135	0.0042
$\frac{1}{t^2+1}$	(2, 2)	200	4406	0.0977	3950	0.0972
$\frac{t}{t+1.5}$	(1, 1)	100	4240	0.013	3137	0.0069
$\frac{t}{t+1.5}$	(2, 2)	200	6490	0.0172	5875	0.009
$\frac{t^2-1}{t+2}$	(2, 2)	200	2361	0.02	1730	0.0437
$\frac{t^2-1}{t+2}$	(3, 2)	100	14643	0.0901	6306	0.0396

subsection we consider as the objective function the continuous function $f(t) = \frac{\sin t - \cos t}{t+2}$. The compact set in all cases are the collection of M equidistant points in the interval $[-1, 1]$. The used stopping criteria is based on the value of the objective function Ψ_i , with $i = 1, 2$ for the two variants. We used $\Psi_i(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq 10^{-2}$. The propose of this examples is compare both variants in the number of iterations and the CPU time.

Algorithm F with non-polynomial						
$h(t)$	(n, m)	M	Iter ₁	CPU ₁	Iter ₂	CPU ₂
e^t	(3, 3)	20	625	16.9063	410	11.3594
e^t	(3, 3)	100	585	21.1875	569	23.4063
e^t	(5, 4)	200	2115	420.531	2094	419.281
e^t	(10, 8)	100	5121	997.875	5099	940.172
$\sin(t)$	(3, 3)	20	255	12.0313	255	11.4513
$\sin(t)$	(3, 3)	100	429	44.6094	311	35.3906
$\sin(t)$	(5, 4)	200	235	52.1094	184	37.4688
$\sin(t)$	(10, 8)	100	136	23.9531	214	20.9688

7 Conclusion

In this paper a new Algorithm, containing two variants, for point-to-set operators without continuity and monotonicity is proposed. We proved that the Clarke subdifferential of the maximal deviation function is a pseudomonotone operator, which is a better than the known quasimonotonicity. An application to solve Rational Approximation problems are tested with different rational functions, and the algorithm obtain a good behaviour and comparing both Variants, the best results in general was obtained by the **Variant 2**, which project onto a small set and just once.

In this paper we also prove that the corresponding objective function in the case of generalised rational approximation are pseudo-convex and therefore it opens a broad avenue for further investigating. In particular, we can apply general methods developed for pseudo-convex functions to generalised rational approximation. Another potential research direction is to investigate the objective functions and optimisation problems in the case of multivariate approximation.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC), Solving hard Chebyshev approximation problems through nonsmooth analysis (Discovery Project DP180100602).

References

1. Achieser, N.I., *Theory of Approximation*, Frederick Ungar, New York, 1965
2. Aussel, D. Subdifferential Properties of Quasiconvex and Pseudoconvex Functions: Unified Approach. *J. Opt. Th. Appl.*: **97**, No. I, pp. 29–45, (1998).
3. Bauschke, H.H., Combettes, Patrick L.: *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*. Springer, New York (2011).
4. Bello Cruz, J.Y., Díaz Millán, R., Phan, H.M. Conditional extragradient algorithms for solving constrained variational inequalities. *Pacific Journal of Optimization* **15** (3), 331–357. (2019).
5. Blair, J.M., Edwards, C.A. and Johnson, J.H., Rational Chebyshev approximations for the inverse of the error function, *Math. Comp.*, 30(136):827– 830, 1976.
6. Boyd, S. and Vandenberghe, L., *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, 2010
7. Burachik, R.S., Díaz Millán, R. A Projection Algorithm for Non-Monotone Variational Inequalities. *Set-Valued Var. Anal* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11228-019-00517-0>.
8. Cheney, E.W, Loeb, H.L , On rational Chebyshev approximation/ *Numerische Mathematik*, **4**, 124–127 (1962).
9. Cheney, E.W. and Loeb, H.L., Generalized rational approximation, *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Series B: Numerical Analysis*, **1**(1), 11–25 (1964), SIAM.
10. Daniilidis A., Hadjisavvas N. On the Subdifferentials of Quasiconvex and Pseudoconvex Functions and Cyclic Monotonicity. *J. Math. An. Appl.* **237**, 30–42, (1999).
11. Peiris, V., Sharon, N. Sukhorukova, N. and Ugon, J., Generalised rational approximation and its application to improve deep learning classifiers, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, In Press.
12. Penot, J.-P. and Quang, P.H. Generalized convexity of functions and generalized monotonicity of set-valued maps, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **92**, 343–356, (1997).
13. Ralston, A., Rational Chebyshev Approximation by Remes’ Algorithms, *Numer. Math.*, **7**(4), 1965, 322–330, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc..
14. Rivlin, T.J., Polynomials of best uniform approximation to certain rational functions, *Numerische Mathematik*, **4**(1), 345–349, 1962, Springer
15. Rockafellar, R. T. and Wets, R. J.B. *Variational Analysis*. Springer, Berlin, 1998.