

CONVEX HULL-LIKE PROPERTY AND SUPPORTED IMAGES OF OPEN SETS

B. RICCERI

Dedicated to Professor Anthony To-Ming Lau, with esteem and friendship

ABSTRACT. In this note, as a particular case of a more general result, we obtain the following theorem:

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ be a non-empty bounded open set and let $f : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ be a continuous function which is C^1 in Ω . Then, at least one of the following assertions holds:

- (a) $f(\Omega) \subseteq \text{conv}(f(\partial\Omega))$.
- (b) There exists a non-empty open set $X \subseteq \Omega$, with $\overline{X} \subseteq \Omega$, satisfying the following property: for every continuous function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ which is C^1 in X , there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 0$ such that, for each $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$, the Jacobian determinant of the function $g + \lambda f$ vanishes at some point of X .

As a consequence, if $n = 2$ and $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a non-negative function, for each $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying in Ω the Monge-Ampère equation

$$u_{xx}u_{yy} - u_{xy}^2 = h ,$$

one has

$$\nabla u(\Omega) \subseteq \text{conv}(\nabla u(\partial\Omega)) .$$

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Here and in what follows, Ω is a non-empty relatively compact and open set in a topological space E , with $\partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, and Y is a real locally convex Hausdorff topological vector space. $\overline{\Omega}$ and $\partial\Omega$ denote the closure and the boundary of Ω , respectively. Since $\overline{\Omega}$ is compact, $\partial\Omega$, being closed, is compact too.

Let us first recall some well-known definitions.

Let S be a subset of Y and let $y_0 \in S$. As usual, we say that S is supported at y_0 if there exists $\varphi \in Y^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\varphi(y_0) \leq \varphi(y)$ for all $y \in S$. If this happens, of course $y_0 \in \partial S$.

Further, extending a maximum principle definition for real-valued functions, a continuous function $f : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow Y$ is said to satisfy the convex hull property in $\overline{\Omega}$ (see [1, 2] and references therein) if

$$f(\Omega) \subseteq \overline{\text{conv}}(f(\partial\Omega)) ,$$

$\overline{\text{conv}}(f(\partial\Omega))$ being the closed convex hull of $f(\partial\Omega)$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35B50; Secondary 26B10, 26A51, 35F05, 35F50, 35J96.

Key words and phrases. Convex hull property, supported set, quasi-convex function, singular point, Monge-Ampère equation.

When $\dim(Y) < \infty$, since $f(\partial\Omega)$ is compact, $\text{conv}(f(\partial\Omega))$ is compact too and so $\overline{\text{conv}}(f(\partial\Omega)) = \text{conv}(f(\partial\Omega))$.

A function $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is said to be quasi-convex if, for each $r \in \mathbf{R}$, the set $\psi^{-1}(] - \infty, r])$ is convex.

Notice the following proposition:

Proposition 1.1. *For each pair A, B of non-empty subsets of Y , the following assertions are equivalent:*

(a₁) $A \subseteq \overline{\text{conv}}(B)$.

(a₂) For every continuous and quasi-convex function $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, one has

$$\sup_A \psi \leq \sup_B \psi .$$

Proof. Let (a₁) hold. Fix any continuous and quasi-convex function $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Fix $\tilde{y} \in A$. Then, there is a net $\{y_\alpha\}$ in $\text{conv}(B)$ converging to \tilde{y} . So, for each α , we have $y_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i z_i$, where $z_i \in B$, $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i = 1$. By quasi-convexity, we have

$$\psi(y_\alpha) = \psi \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i z_i \right) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \psi(z_i) \leq \sup_B \psi$$

and so, by continuity,

$$\psi(\tilde{y}) = \lim_\alpha \psi(y_\alpha) \leq \sup_B \psi$$

which yields (a₂).

Now, let (a₂) hold. Let $x_0 \in A$. If $x_0 \notin \overline{\text{conv}}(B)$, by the standard separation theorem, there would be $\psi \in Y^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sup_{\overline{\text{conv}}(B)} \psi < \psi(x_0)$, against (a₂). So, (a₁) holds. \square

Clearly, applying Proposition 1.1, we obtain the following one:

Proposition 1.2. *For any continuous function $f : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow Y$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

(b₁) f satisfies the convex hull property in $\overline{\Omega}$.

(b₂) For every continuous and quasi-convex function $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, one has

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x)) = \sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} \psi(f(x)).$$

In view of Proposition 1.2, we now introduce the notion of convex hull-like property for functions defined in Ω only.

Definition 1.3. A continuous function $f : \Omega \rightarrow Y$ is said to satisfy the convex hull-like property in Ω if, for every continuous and quasi-convex function $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, there exists $x^* \in \partial\Omega$ such that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow x^*} \psi(f(x)) = \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x)) .$$

We have

Proposition 1.4. *Let $g : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow Y$ be a continuous function and let $f = g|_{\Omega}$. Then, the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (c₁) f satisfies the convex hull-like property in Ω .
- (c₂) g satisfies the convex hull property in $\overline{\Omega}$.

Proof. Let (c₁) hold. Let $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be any continuous and quasi-convex function. Then, by Definition 1.3, there exists $x^* \in \partial\Omega$ such that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow x^*} \psi(f(x)) = \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x)) .$$

But

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow x^*} \psi(f(x)) = \psi(g(x^*))$$

and hence

$$\sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} \psi(g(x)) = \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(g(x)) .$$

So, by Proposition 1.2, (c₂) holds.

Now, let (c₂) hold. Let $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be any continuous and quasi-convex function. Then, by Proposition 1.2, one has

$$\sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} \psi(g(x)) = \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(g(x)) .$$

Since $\partial\Omega$ is compact and $\psi \circ g$ is continuous, there exists $x^* \in \partial\Omega$ such that

$$\psi(g(x^*)) = \sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} \psi(g(x)) .$$

But

$$\psi(g(x^*)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow x^*} \psi(f(x))$$

and, by continuity again,

$$\sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(g(x)) = \sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} \psi(g(x))$$

and so

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow x^*} \psi(f(x)) = \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x))$$

which yields (c₁). □

After the above preliminaries, we can declare the aim of this short note: to establish Theorem 1.5 below jointly with some of its consequences.

Theorem 1.5. *For any continuous function $f : \Omega \rightarrow Y$, at least one of the following assertions holds:*

- (i) f satisfies the convex hull-like property in Ω .
- (ii) There exists a non-empty open set $X \subseteq \Omega$, with $\overline{X} \subseteq \Omega$, satisfying the following property: for every continuous function $g : \Omega \rightarrow Y$, there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 0$ such that, for each $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$, the set $(g + \lambda f)(X)$ is supported at one of its points.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

Assume that (i) does not hold. So, we are assuming that there exists a continuous and quasi-convex function $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow z} \psi(f(x)) < \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x)) \quad (2.1)$$

for all $z \in \partial\Omega$.

In view of (2.1), for each $z \in \partial\Omega$, there exists an open neighbourhood U_z of z such that

$$\sup_{x \in U_z \cap \Omega} \psi(f(x)) < \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x)) .$$

Since $\partial\Omega$ is compact, there are finitely many $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \partial\Omega$ such that

$$\partial\Omega \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_{z_i} . \quad (2.2)$$

Put

$$U = \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_{z_i} .$$

Hence

$$\sup_{x \in U \cap \Omega} \psi(f(x)) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sup_{x \in U_{z_i} \cap \Omega} \psi(f(x)) < \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x)) .$$

Now, fix a number r so that

$$\sup_{x \in U \cap \Omega} \psi(f(x)) < r < \sup_{x \in \Omega} \psi(f(x)) \quad (2.3)$$

and set

$$K = \{x \in \Omega : \psi(f(x)) \geq r\} .$$

Since f, ψ are continuous, K is closed in Ω . But, since $K \cap U = \emptyset$ and U is open, in view of (2.2), K is closed in E . Hence, K is compact since $\bar{\Omega}$ is so. By (2.3), we can fix $\bar{x} \in \Omega$ such that $\psi(f(\bar{x})) > r$. Notice that the set $\psi^{-1}(]-\infty, r])$ is closed and convex. So, thanks to the standard separation theorem, there exists a non-zero continuous linear functional $\varphi : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$\varphi(f(\bar{x})) < \inf_{y \in \psi^{-1}(]-\infty, r])} \varphi(y) . \quad (2.4)$$

Then, from (2.4), it follows

$$\varphi(f(\bar{x})) < \inf_{x \in \Omega \setminus K} \varphi(f(x)) .$$

Now, choose ρ so that

$$\varphi(f(\bar{x})) < \rho < \inf_{x \in \Omega \setminus K} \varphi(f(x))$$

and set

$$X = \{x \in \Omega : \varphi(f(x)) < \rho\} .$$

Clearly, X is a non-empty open set contained in K . Now, let $g : \Omega \rightarrow Y$ be any continuous function. Set

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \inf_{x \in X} \frac{\varphi(g(x)) - \inf_{z \in K} \varphi(g(z))}{\rho - \varphi(f(x))} .$$

Fix $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$. So, there is $x_0 \in X$ such that

$$\frac{\varphi(g(x_0)) - \inf_{z \in K} \varphi(g(z))}{\rho - \varphi(f(x_0))} < \lambda .$$

From this, we get

$$\varphi(g(x_0)) + \lambda \varphi(f(x_0)) < \lambda \rho + \inf_{z \in K} \varphi(g(z)) . \quad (2.5)$$

By continuity and compactness, there exists $\hat{x} \in K$ such that

$$\varphi(g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x})) \leq \varphi(g(x_0)) + \lambda \varphi(f(x_0)) \quad (2.6)$$

for all $x \in K$. Let us prove that $\hat{x} \in X$. Arguing by contradiction, assume that $\varphi(f(\hat{x})) \geq \rho$. Then, taking (2.5) into account, we would have

$$\varphi(g(x_0)) + \lambda \varphi(f(x_0)) < \lambda \varphi(f(\hat{x})) + \varphi(g(\hat{x}))$$

contradicting (6). So, it is true that $\hat{x} \in X$, and, by (2.6), the set $(g + \lambda f)(X)$ is supported at its point $g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x})$.

3. APPLICATIONS

The first application of Theorem 1.5 shows a strongly bifurcating behaviour of certain equations in \mathbf{R}^n .

Theorem 3.1. *Let Ω be a non-empty bounded open subset of \mathbf{R}^n and let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ a continuous function.*

Then, at least one of the following assertions holds:

- (d₁) *f satisfies the convex hull-like property in Ω .*
- (d₂) *There exists a non-empty open set $X \subseteq \Omega$, with $\overline{X} \subseteq \Omega$, satisfying the following property: for every continuous function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$, there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 0$ such that, for each $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$, there exist $\hat{x} \in X$ and two sequences $\{y_k\}$, $\{z_k\}$ in \mathbf{R}^n , with*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_k = g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x}) ,$$

such that, for each $k \in \mathbf{N}$, one has

(j) *the equation*

$$g(x) + \lambda f(x) = y_k$$

has no solution in X ;

(jj) *the equation*

$$g(x) + \lambda f(x) = z_k$$

has two distinct solutions u_k, v_k in X such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} v_k = \hat{x} .$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 1.5 with $E = Y = \mathbf{R}^n$. Assume that (d_1) does not hold. Let $X \subseteq \Omega$ be an open set as in (ii) of Theorem 1.5. Fix any continuous function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$. Then, there is some $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 0$ such that, for each $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$, there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that the set $(g + \lambda f)(X)$ is supported at $g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x})$. As we observed at the beginning, this implies that $g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x})$ lies in the boundary of $(g + \lambda f)(X)$. Therefore, we can find a sequence $\{y_k\}$ in $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus (g + \lambda f)(X)$ converging to $g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x})$. So, such a sequence satisfies (j). For each $k \in \mathbf{N}$, denote by B_k the open ball of radius $\frac{1}{k}$ centered at \hat{x} . Let k be such that $B_k \subseteq X$. The set $(g + \lambda f)(B_k)$ is not open since its boundary contains the point $g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x})$. Consequently, by the invariance of domain theorem ([3], p. 705), the function $g + \lambda f$ is not injective in B_k . So, there are $u_k, v_k \in B_k$, with $u_k \neq v_k$ such that

$$g(u_k) + \lambda f(u_k) = g(v_k) + \lambda f(v_k) .$$

Hence, if we take

$$z_k = g(u_k) + \lambda f(u_k) ,$$

the sequences $\{u_k\}, \{v_k\}, \{z_k\}$ satisfy (jj) and the proof is complete. \square

Remark 3.2. Notice that, in general, Theorem 3.1 is no longer true when $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^m$ with $m > n$. In this connection, consider the case $n = 1, m = 2, \Omega =]0, \pi[$ and $f(\theta) = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, \pi]$. So, for each $\lambda > 0$, on the one hand, the function λf is injective, while, on the other hand, $\lambda f(]0, \pi[)$ is not contained in $\text{conv}(\{f(0), f(\pi)\})$.

If $S \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ is a non-empty open set, $x \in S$ and $h : S \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a C^1 function, we denote by $\det(J_h(x))$ the Jacobian determinant of h at x .

Another important consequence of Theorem 1.5 is as follows:

Theorem 3.3. *Let Ω be a non-empty bounded open subset of \mathbf{R}^n and let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ be a C^1 function.*

Then, at least one of the following assertions holds:

- (e₁) *f satisfies the convex hull-like property in Ω .*
- (e₂) *There exists a non-empty open set $X \subseteq \Omega$, with $\bar{X} \subseteq \Omega$, satisfying the following property: for every continuous function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ which is C^1 in X , there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 0$ such that, for each $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$, one has*

$$\det(J_{g+\lambda f}(\hat{x})) = 0$$

for some $\hat{x} \in X$.

Proof. Assume that (e₁) does not hold. Let X be an open set as in (ii) of Theorem 1.5. Let $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ be a continuous function which is C^1 in X . Then, there is some $\tilde{\lambda} \geq 0$ such that, for each $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}$, there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that the set $(g + \lambda f)(X)$ is supported at $g(\hat{x}) + \lambda f(\hat{x})$. By remarks already made, we infer that the function $g + \lambda f$ is not a local homeomorphism at \hat{x} , and so $\det(J_{g+\lambda f}(\hat{x})) = 0$ in view of the classical inverse function theorem. \square

In turn, here is a consequence of Theorem 3.3 when $n = 2$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let Ω be a non-empty bounded open set of \mathbf{R}^2 , let $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function and let $\alpha, \beta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be two C^1 functions such that $|\alpha_x\beta_y - \alpha_y\beta_x| + |h| > 0$ and $(\alpha_x\beta_y - \alpha_y\beta_x)h \geq 0$ in Ω .*

Then, any C^1 solution (u, v) in Ω of the system

$$\begin{cases} u_x v_y - u_y v_x = h, \\ \beta_y u_x - \beta_x u_y - \alpha_y v_x + \alpha_x v_y = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

satisfies the convex hull-like property in Ω .

Proof. Arguing by contradiction, assume that (u, v) does not satisfy the convex hull-like property in Ω . Then, by Theorem 3.3, applied taking $f = (u, v)$ and $g = (\alpha, \beta)$, there exist $\lambda > 0$ and $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \Omega$ such that

$$\det(J_{g+\lambda f}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})) = 0 .$$

On the other hand, for each $(x, y) \in \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(J_{g+\lambda f}(x, y)) &= (u_x v_y - u_y v_x)(x, y)\lambda^2 + (\beta_y u_x - \beta_x u_y - \alpha_y v_x + \alpha_x v_y)(x, y)\lambda \\ &+ (\alpha_x \beta_y - \alpha_y \beta_x)(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$h(\hat{x}, \hat{y})\lambda^2 + (\alpha_x \beta_y - \alpha_y \beta_x)(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = 0$$

which is impossible in view of our assumptions. \square

We conclude by highlighting two applications of Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 3.5. *Let Ω be a non-empty bounded open subset of \mathbf{R}^2 , let $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous non-negative function and let $w \in C^2(\Omega)$ be a function satisfying in Ω the Monge-Ampère equation*

$$w_{xx}w_{yy} - w_{xy}^2 = h .$$

Then, the gradient of w satisfies the convex hull-like property in Ω .

Proof. It is enough to observe that (w_x, w_y) is a C^1 solution in Ω of the system (3.1) with $\alpha(x, y) = -y$ and $\beta(x, y) = x$ and that such α, β satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 3.4. \square

Theorem 3.6. *Let Ω be a non-empty bounded open subset of \mathbf{R}^2 and let $\beta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a C^1 function. Assume that there exists another C^1 function $\alpha : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ so that the function $\alpha_x\beta_y - \alpha_y\beta_x$ vanishes at no point of Ω .*

Then, for any function $u \in C^1(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying in Ω the equation

$$\beta_y u_x - \beta_x u_y = 0 ,$$

one has

$$\sup_{\Omega} u = \sup_{\partial\Omega} u$$

and

$$\inf_{\Omega} u = \inf_{\partial\Omega} u .$$

Proof. Observe that the function $(u, 0)$ satisfies the system (3.1) with $h = 0$ and that the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 are fulfilled. So, $(u, 0)$ satisfies the convex hull-like property in Ω . Since $u \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$, the conclusion follows from Proposition 1.4. \square

Acknowledgement. The author has been supported by the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM).

REFERENCES

1. L. DIENING, C. KREUZER and S. SCHWARZACHER, *Convex hull property and maximum principle for finite element minimisers of general convex functionals*, Numer. Math., **124** (2013), 685-700.
2. N. I. KATZOURAKIS, *Maximum principles for vectorial approximate minimizers of non-convex functionals*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ., **46** (2013), 505-522.
3. E. ZEIDLER, *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications*, vol. I, Springer-Verlag, 1986.

¹ DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CATANIA, VIALE A. DORIA 6, 95125 CATANIA, ITALY

E-mail address: ricceri@dmf.unict.it