

Josef Nedoma

Complete extension of a convex function

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 30 (1980), No. 1, 36–40

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/101653>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 1980

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://dml.cz>

COMPLETE EXTENSION OF A CONVEX FUNCTION

JOSEF NEDOMA, Praha

(Received January 6, 1978)

When studying the properties of subsets of the so-called convex manifolds a special attention is paid to a class of convex functions the definition domain of which is "as large as possible". A certain type of such functions is called complete here (see Def. 2). In this paper the problem of extending a convex function to a complete convex function is discussed. In order to explain the motivation of our approach we mention briefly the problem of the analytic expression of a relatively convex surface.

We shall deal with the real linear space R^n (or R^{n+1}). The closure, the boundary and the convex hull of a set A are denoted by $\text{cl } A$, $\text{bd } A$ and $[A]$, respectively. Further, $\text{ray } A$ is the set of all positive multiples of the elements of A and A^* is the polar cone of A . (We shall consider polar cones both in R^n and in R^{n+1}). The normal cone of a set A at a point $x \in A$ is denoted by $N(A)(x)$, i.e. $N(A)(x) = \{v \mid A \subset x + \{v\}^*, v \neq 0\}$. A closed halfspace H is called a supporting halfspace of A if $A \subset H$ and $A \cap \text{bd } H \neq \emptyset$. The term function means a finite function exclusively. The domain of definition of a function f is denoted by $\text{dom } f$ and $\partial f(x)$ means the subdifferential of f at a point x . Finally, $N(A) = \bigcup \{N(A)(x) \mid x \in A\}$, $\partial f(A) = \bigcup \{\partial f(x) \mid x \in A\}$ and $\partial f = \partial f(\text{dom } f)$.

I. RELATIVELY CONVEX SURFACES

A surface $P \subset R^n$ is called *relatively convex with respect to a vector u* (briefly: *u -convex*) if 1°. $u \notin \text{cl ray}(P - P)$ and 2°. $P + \text{ray}\{u\}$ is a convex set.

Consider a convex function $f: R^n \rightarrow R$. It can be easily shown that $P = \{x \mid f(x) = 0\}$ is u -convex for each $u \in \text{int}(\partial f(P))^*$ provided $\partial f(P)$ does not contain the zero vector. Indeed: If $x^1, x^2 \in P$ then there exists no $t > 0$ such that $u = t(x^1 - x^2)$ since otherwise $f(x^1) \leq f(x^2) + \langle v, x^1 - x^2 \rangle < 0$ would hold for $v \in \partial f(x^1)$, which would contradict the assumption $x^1 \in P$. Consequently $u \notin \text{ray}(P - P)$ and therefore 1° is fulfilled because $\text{int}(\partial f(P))^*$ is open. Further, $x + \text{ray}\{u\} \subset M^- = \{x \mid f(x) < 0\}$ for every $x \in P$ and conversely $(z - \text{ray}\{u\}) \cap P \neq \emptyset$ for every $z \in M^-$ so that $P + \text{ray}\{u\} = M^-$ which is convex.

The latter argument, however, cannot be used in the case that f is defined in a convex region $G \neq R^n$. From this point of view it is interesting to study the problem of extending a given convex function f to the whole space in such a manner that $(\partial f)^*$ is kept. If such an extension is possible then the mentioned surface stands for a part of a relatively convex one.

This problem is even more important in the case of manifolds the dimension of which is less than $n - 1$.

II. COMPLETE CONVEX FUNCTIONS

Definition 1. A function f is called *open* if $F = \{(x, \mu) \mid \mu > f(x), x \in \text{dom } f\}$ is an open set in R^{n+1} .

Lemma 1. *An open function is continuous.*

Proof. Let $Y \subset R$ be an arbitrary open interval. Then $Z = (R^n \times Y) \cap F$ is an open set and therefore its orthogonal projection $X = f^{-1}(Y)$ into R^n is also open. \square

Lemma 2. *A continuous function f is open if and only if $\text{dom } f$ is open.*

Proof. Let $\text{dom } f$ be open and choose $(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu}) \in F$. Then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a neighbourhood $O(\bar{x}) \subset \text{dom } f$ such that $f(x) < \bar{\mu} - \varepsilon \forall x \in O(\bar{x})$. Hence $\Omega = \{(x, \mu) \mid \mu > \bar{\mu} - \varepsilon, x \in O(\bar{x})\}$ is an open set satisfying $(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu}) \in \Omega \subset F$. Thus F is open. The “only if” part of the lemma holds trivially. \square

Corollary 2.1. *A convex function f is open if and only if $\text{dom } f$ is open.*

Definition 2. A function is called *complete* if it is both open and closed.

Theorem 1. *A convex function is complete if and only if it increases infinitely near the boundary of its definition domain.*

Proof. a) If the condition is satisfied then $\text{bd}(\text{dom } f) \cap \text{dom } f = \emptyset$ which means that $\text{dom } f$ is open and therefore f is open according to Lemma 2. On the other hand for every $(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu}) \in \text{bd}(\text{epi } f)$ we have $\bar{\mu} < +\infty$ and hence $(\bar{x}, \bar{\mu}) \in \text{graph } f \subset \text{epi } f$. Thus f is closed and therefore complete.

b) Suppose that there exist a point $x^0 \in \text{bd } \text{dom } f$ and a number α such that $\inf \{f(x) \mid x \in O(x^0) \cap \text{dom } f\} < \alpha$ for any neighbourhood $O(x^0)$ of x^0 . Then there is a sequence x^k such that $x^k \in \text{dom } f$, $x^k \rightarrow x^0$ and $f(x^k) \leq \alpha$. Hence $x^0 \in \text{dom}(\text{cl } f)$ which means that either $x^0 \in \text{dom } f$ (then f cannot be open) or $f \neq \text{cl } f$ (f is not closed). \square

Note 1. A convex function defined in the whole space is complete.

III. UPPER AND LOWER EXTENSIONS OF A CONVEX FUNCTION

Let f be a convex function and consider the sets $K_f = N(\text{epi } f) = \{(tv, -t) \mid v \in \partial f, t > 0\}$ and

$$A_f = \text{cl}(\text{epi } f + K_f^*).$$

Evidently $e^{n+1} = (0^n, 1) \in K_f^*$ and thus $A_f + \text{ray } e^{n+1} = A_f$. It means that A_f stands for the epigraph of a finite function.

Definition 3. Let f be an open convex function. Then a function f^{up} defined by

$$(1) \quad \text{epi } f^{\text{up}} = \text{cl}(\text{epi } f + K_f^*)$$

will be called an *upper extension* of f .

Let us denote by Z_f the intersection of all supporting halfspaces of $\text{epi } f$.

Definition 4. Let f be an open convex function. Then the function f^{low} defined by

$$(2) \quad \text{epi } f^{\text{low}} = Z_f$$

will be called a *lower extension* of f .

Note 2. f^{low} is the supremum of all linear functions h such that $h \leq f$ and $h(x) = f(x)$ for an $x \in \text{dom } f$.

Theorem 2. Let f be an open convex function. Then

- 1°. $f^{\text{up}}, f^{\text{low}}$ are closed convex functions;
- 2°. $\text{dom } f \subset \text{dom } f^{\text{low}} = \text{dom } f^{\text{up}}$;
- 3°. $f^{\text{low}} \leq f^{\text{up}}$;
- 4°. $f^{\text{low}}(x) = f^{\text{up}}(x) = f(x) \forall x \in \text{dom } f$;
- 5°. $\partial f^{\text{low}} \subset \text{cl}[\partial f], \partial f^{\text{up}} \subset \text{cl}[\partial f]$.

Proof. 1° follows immediately from (1), (2). To verify 2° take notice first of all that

$$(3) \quad \text{int dom } f^{\text{low}} \subset \text{dom } f^{\text{up}}.$$

Indeed, $x^0 \in \text{bd}(\text{dom } f^{\text{up}})$ implies that $(w, 0) \in \text{cl } K_f$ for any $w \in N(\text{dom } f^{\text{up}})(x^0)$. Therefore there exist supporting halfspaces H_k of $\text{epi } f$ such that their normals converge to $(w, 0)$. It means that there exists an α such that $H_0 = \{x \mid \langle w, x \rangle \leq \alpha\} \subset R^n$ is a supporting halfspace of both $\text{cl dom } f$ and $\text{cl dom } f^{\text{low}}$. Since $\text{epi } f \subset f^{\text{up}}$ and consequently $\text{dom } f \subset \text{dom } f^{\text{up}}$, we have $x^0 \notin \text{int } H_0$ which proves (3). Further, $K_f^* = (K_{f^{\text{low}}})^*$ yields $A_f \subset Z_f + K_f^* = Z_f$ which together with (3) proves 2° and also 3°.

According to Note 2, $f(x) \leq f^{\text{low}}(x) \forall x \in \text{dom } f$. This together with 2° yields 4°

since $\text{epi } f \subset \text{epi } f^{\text{up}}$. Finally, we have $N(A_f) \subset K_f^{**}$, $N(Z_f) \subset K_f^{**}$. Since $K_f^{**} = \text{cl}[K_f]$, the relations (1), (2) yield 5°. \square

Of course, the functions f^{low} , f^{up} are not identical in general. See the following

Example. Consider $f : G \rightarrow R$ where G is the positive orthant of R^2 and

$$f = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ x_1 - x_2 - 1 \\ -x_1 \end{array} \right\}, \quad x \in G.$$

Evidently, f is open and convex. Then

$$f^{\text{up}} = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ x_1 - x_2 - 1 \\ -x_1 \\ -\frac{1}{2}x_2 \end{array} \right\}, \quad x \in R^2$$

while

$$f^{\text{low}} = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ x_1 - x_2 - 1 \\ -x_1 \end{array} \right\}, \quad x \in R^2.$$

Both the extensions are defined in the whole space and therefore they are complete.

Theorem 3. *Let f, g be open convex functions such that*

1°. $g(x) = f(x) \quad \forall x \in \text{dom } f$;

2°. $\partial g \subset \text{cl}[\partial f]$.

Then $f^{\text{low}} \leq g \leq f^{\text{up}}$.

Proof. a) To verify $f^{\text{low}} \leq g$ suppose that there exists an $y \in R^n$ such that $g(y) < f^{\text{low}}(y)$. Then there is a supporting halfspace H of $\text{epi } f$ at a point $(x, f(x)) \in \text{graph } f$, such that $(y, g(y)) \notin H$. It means that g is not convex which contradicts the hypothesis.

b) Since $\text{epi } f \subset \text{epi } g$ and $K_f^* \subset K_g^*$ due to 2°, we have $\text{epi } f^{\text{up}} \subset \text{epi } g^{\text{up}}$ or $g^{\text{up}} \leq f^{\text{up}}$. It proves $g \leq f^{\text{up}}$ because $g^{\text{up}}(x) = g(x) \quad \forall x \in \text{dom } g$ according to Theorem 2. \square

Theorem 4. *If f is a complete convex function then*

$$f^{\text{up}} = f^{\text{low}} = f.$$

Proof. Every closed convex set A can be expressed as the intersection of its supporting halfspaces, i.e. $A = A + (N(A))^*$. Applying this to $A = \text{epi } f$ we obtain the statement of the theorem.

Lemma 3. *An open convex function f satisfies the Lipschitz condition if and only if ∂f is bounded.*

Proof. a) We have $\langle u, x^1 - x^2 \rangle \leq f(x^1) - f(x^2) \leq -\langle v, x^2 - x^1 \rangle \forall x^1, x^2 \in \text{dom } f, u \in \partial f(x^2), v \in \partial f(x^1)$. If ∂f is bounded then the set of norms of all subgradients of f possesses a finite supremum β which can be taken as the Lipschitz constant:

$$(4) \quad |f(x^2) - f(x^1)| \leq \beta |x^2 - x^1| \quad \forall x^1, x^2 \in \text{dom } f.$$

b) For any $x^1 \in \text{dom } f$ and $v \in \partial f(x^1)$ there exists a $t > 0$ such that $x^2 = x^1 + tv \in \text{dom } f$. Then

$$f(x^2) - f(x^1) \geq \langle v, x^2 - x^1 \rangle = |v| |x^2 - x^1|.$$

Consequently: if ∂f is not bounded then there is no β satisfying (4). \square

Theorem 5. *Let f be an open convex Lipschitz-type function. Then $f^{\text{up}}, f^{\text{low}}$ are complete convex functions.*

Proof. ∂f is bounded by Lemma 3 and thus for an arbitrary $w \in R^n$ there exists $t > 0$ such that

$$(5) \quad \langle (w, t), (v, -1) \rangle = \langle w, v \rangle - t \leq 0 \quad \forall v \in \partial f.$$

Every vector (w, t) satisfying (5) belongs to K_f^* . Since $\text{dom } f^{\text{up}}$ stands for the orthogonal projection of $\text{epi } f^{\text{up}} = \text{cl}(\text{epi } f + K_f^*)$ into R^n , we have $\text{dom } f^{\text{up}} = R^n$. The same holds for $\text{dom } f^{\text{low}}$ according to Theorem 2. \square

References

- Nedoma, J.:* Relatively Convex Analysis, Research publ. No 50, EML EÚ, ČSAV, Prague, 1977 (Dissertation paper).
Rockafellar, R. T.: Convex Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970.
Stoer, J., Witzgall, C.: Convexity and Optimization in Finite Dimensions I, Springer, Berlin—Heidelberg—New York, 1970.
Nedoma, J.: Relatively Convex Sets and Functions in R^n , Mathematische Operationsforschung und Statistik — Series Optimization, Vol. 10 (1979), No 1.

Author's address: 111 73 Praha 1, Politických vězňů 7, ČSSR. (Ekonomicko-matematická laboratoř EÚ ČSAV).