

Feasibility problems via paramonotone operators in a convex setting*

J. Camacho[†] M.J. Cánovas[†] J.E. Martínez-Legaz[‡]
J. Parra[†]

Abstract

This paper is focused on some properties of paramonotone operators on Banach spaces and their application to certain feasibility problems for convex sets in a Hilbert space and convex systems in the Euclidean space. In particular, it shows that operators that are simultaneously paramonotone and bimonotone are constant on their domains, and this fact is applied to tackle two particular situations. The first one, closely related to simultaneous projections, deals with a finite amount of convex sets with an empty intersection and tackles the problem of finding the smallest perturbations (in the sense of translations) of these sets to reach a nonempty intersection. The second is focused on the distance to feasibility; specifically, given an inconsistent convex inequality system, our goal is to compute/estimate the smallest right-hand side perturbations that reach feasibility. We advance that this work derives lower and upper estimates of such a distance, which become the exact value when confined to linear systems.

Key words. Distance function, convex inequalities, distance to feasibility, paramonotone operators, displacement mapping

Mathematics Subject Classification: 47N10, 47H05, 52A20, 90C31, 49K40

*This research has been partially supported by Grant PGC2018-097960-B-C21 from MICINN, Spain, and ERDF, "A way to make Europe", European Union, and Grant PROMETEO/2021/063 from Generalitat Valenciana, Spain. The third author has also been partially supported by the Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D [SEV-2015-0563]. He is affiliated with MOVE (Markets, Organizations and Votes in Economics).

[†]Center of Operations Research, Miguel Hernández University of Elche, 03202 Elche (Alicante), Spain (j.camacho@umh.es, canovas@umh.es, parra@umh.es).

[‡]Departament d'Economia i d'Història Econòmica, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, and BGSMath, Barcelona, Spain (JuanEnrique.Martinez.Legaz@uab.cat).

1 Introduction

The present paper is focused on paramonotone operators with applications to certain feasibility problems for convex sets in a Hilbert space and convex inequality systems in \mathbb{R}^n . To start with, we recall some basic properties of operators in Banach spaces. Let X be a real Banach space, with topological dual X^* , and denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the corresponding canonical pairing. A set-valued operator $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ is said to be *monotone* if

$$\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle \geq 0 \text{ whenever } (x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph}T,$$

where $\text{gph}T := \{(x, x^*) \in X \times X^* : x^* \in T(x)\}$ is the graph of T . In the case when both T and $-T$ are monotone, then T is called *bimonotone*. If T is monotone and, in addition, $\text{gph}T$ is maximal in the sense of inclusion order, it is said to be *maximally monotone*. A well-known example of maximally monotone operator is the subdifferential operator of a proper, lower semicontinuous (lsc, for short), convex function $f : X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$, denoted by ∂f (see Section 2 for details). Monotone operators are fundamental tools of nonlinear analysis and optimization; see, e.g., the books [1, 6, 7, 18, 20, 22, 23]. A monotone operator T is called *paramonotone* if the following implication holds:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph}T \\ \langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow (x, y^*), (y, x^*) \in \text{gph}T.$$

The term paramonotonicity was introduced in [12] (although the condition was previously presented in [9] without a name). The initial motivation for the introduction of paramonotone operators comes from its crucial role regarding interior point methods for variational inequalities (see again [9] and [12], and also [14]). Some important examples of paramonotone operators are gathered in Section 2. At this moment, let us mention that subdifferentials of proper lsc convex functions enjoy this property (see [14, Proposition 2.2] in the Euclidean space and [3, Fact 3.1] for its extension to Banach spaces).

Looking at the applications of Sections 4 and 5, we are interested in operators of the form $T_1 \cap (-T_2)$, where $T_1, T_2 : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ are paramonotone, which are also paramonotone and, additionally, bimonotone; this fact entails that $T_1 \cap (-T_2)$ is constant on its domain (as shown in Corollary 9); recall that the domain of an operator T is given by $\text{dom}T := \{x \in X \mid T(x) \neq \emptyset\}$. Observe that

$$\text{dom}(T_1 \cap (-T_2)) = \{x \in X \mid 0 \in (T_1 + T_2)(x)\}, \quad (1)$$

which, in the particular case $T_i = \partial f_i$, $i = 1, 2$, where the f_i 's are proper, lsc and convex, is known to coincide with

$$\arg \min (f_1 + f_2), \quad (2)$$

i.e., with the set of (global) minima of $f_1 + f_2$, provided that a regularity condition ensuring $\partial f_1 + \partial f_2 = \partial (f_1 + f_2)$ is satisfied. These comments easily

generalize to the sum of a finite number of functions (see Section 3 for details) and are applied to particular problems of the form

$$\underset{x \in X}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x), \quad (3)$$

where all f_i 's are proper lsc convex functions on X .

Now we present two applications discussed in the paper. The first one is developed in a Hilbert space X whose norm, associated with the corresponding inner product, is denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. It deals with a finite number of nonempty closed convex sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^m S_i = \emptyset$ and is focused on the optimization problem given by

$$\underset{x \in X}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i d(x, S_i)^p, \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$; without loss of generality we assume $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 1$, $p \geq 1$ and $d(x, S_i)$ denotes the distance from point x to set S_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$. The following proposition establishes that (4) is equivalent to the problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && \|u\|_{\alpha,p} \\ &\text{subject to} && \bigcap_{i=1}^m (S_i + u_i) \neq \emptyset, \\ &&& u = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in X^m, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\|u\|_{\alpha,p}$ denotes the weighted p -norm in space X^m defined as

$$\|u\|_{\alpha,p} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \|u_i\|^p \right)^{1/p}. \quad (6)$$

This equivalence was already observed in [2, Section 4] for Euclidean spaces; we include a proof for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 1 *A point $\bar{u} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_m) \in X^m$ is an optimal solution to (5) if and only if there exist an optimal solution \bar{x} to (4) such that $\bar{u}_i = \bar{x} - P_i(\bar{x})$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, with $P_i(\bar{x})$ being the best approximation of \bar{x} in S_i .*

Proof. Let $\bar{u} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_m) \in X^m$ be an optimal solution to (5), and take $\bar{x} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^m (S_i + \bar{u}_i)$. There exist $s_i \in S_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, such that $\bar{x} = s_i + \bar{u}_i$. For every $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i d(\bar{x}, S_i)^p &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \|\bar{x} - s_i\|^p = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \|\bar{u}_i\|^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \|x - P_i(x)\|^p \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i d(x, S_i)^p. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

To justify the latter inequality, observe that $\cap_{i=1}^m (S_i + x - P_i(x)) \neq \emptyset$, because from the equalities $x = P_i(x) + x - P_i(x)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, it immediately follows that $x \in \cap_{i=1}^m (S_i + x - P_i(x))$. Thus, \bar{x} is an optimal solution to (4). Furthermore, setting $x = \bar{x}$, we also deduce that $d(\bar{x}, S_i) = \|\bar{x} - s_i\|$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, that is, $s_i = P_i(\bar{x})$, so that $\bar{u}_i = \bar{x}_i - s_i = \bar{x}_i - P_i(\bar{x})$.

Conversely, let \bar{x} be an optimal solution to (4), u be a feasible solution to (5), and take $x \in \cap_{i=1}^m (S_i + u_i)$. Then, there exist $s_i \in S_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, such that $x = s_i + u_i$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{\alpha,p}^p &= \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \|u_i\|^p = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \|x - s_i\|^p \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i d(x, S_i)^p \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i d(\bar{x}, S_i)^p \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \|\bar{x} - P_i(\bar{x})\|^p, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

which shows that the point $\bar{u} = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_m)$, with $\bar{u}_i := \bar{x}_i - P_i(\bar{x})$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, is an optimal solution to (5). ■

According to Proposition 1, problem (4) is equivalent to that of finding the smallest translations of the sets S_i that achieve a nonempty intersection.

The second application, developed in Section 5, deals with convex inequality systems in \mathbb{R}^n parameterized with respect to the right-hand side (RHS, in brief),

$$\sigma(b) := \{g_i(x) \leq b_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}, \tag{9}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of decision variables and, for each $i \in 1, \dots, m$, $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a (finite-valued) convex function on \mathbb{R}^n , and $(b_i)_{i=1, \dots, m} \equiv b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Taking a nominal $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\sigma(\bar{b})$ is inconsistent (i.e., there is no $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying all inequalities of $\sigma(\bar{b})$), our aim is to estimate the distance in \mathbb{R}^m endowed with any p -norm, with $p \geq 2$, from \bar{b} to the set of parameters b such that $\sigma(b)$ is consistent. This *distance to feasibility* can be computed by solving the following problem:

$$\underset{x \in X}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - b_i]_+^p, \tag{10}$$

which also adapts to the format of (3). Sharper results are presented for linear systems when $p = 2$.

At this point, we summarize the structure of the paper. Section 2 gathers some background on convex sets, convex functions, and monotone operators, which is appealed to in the remaining sections. Section 3 explores some new properties of paramonotone operators and, in particular, analyzes the simultaneous fulfilment of paramonotonicity and bimonotonicity. The problem of simultaneous projections -see (4) and (5)- is tackled in Section 4, while the distance to feasibility of convex systems under RHS perturbations is dealt with in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

Let X be a real Banach space and $f : X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ be a proper lsc convex function. We denote by $\text{dom} f := \{x \in X \mid f(x) < +\infty\}$ the domain of function f . Recall that the subdifferential operator of f , $\partial f : X \rightrightarrows X^*$, assigns to each $x \in \text{dom} f$ the (possibly empty) set $\partial f(x)$ formed by all $x^* \in X^*$ (called subgradients) such that

$$f(y) - f(x) \geq \langle y - x, x^* \rangle, \text{ for all } y \in X.$$

When $x \notin \text{dom} f$ we define $\partial f(x) := \emptyset$; in this way the domain of the set-valued mapping, $\text{dom} \partial f$, is always contained in $\text{dom} f$. Associated with f , its Fenchel conjugative function $f^* : X^* \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ is given by

$$f^*(x^*) = \sup \{ \langle x, x^* \rangle - f(x) \mid x \in X \}.$$

Recall that the Young-Fenchel inequality writes as $f^*(x^*) + f(x) \geq \langle x, x^* \rangle$ for all $x \in X$.

For completeness, we gather in the following theorem some well-known results about ∂f and f^* in Banach spaces used in the paper. They can be traced out from different references dealing with convex analysis in infinite dimensional spaces. Here, we mainly cite the books [6, 15, 17, 23]. From now on, $\text{int} A$ denotes the interior of $A \subset X$ (where, as usual, \subset is understood as \subseteq) and the zero vector of X^* is denoted by just 0.

Theorem 2 *Let $f : X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ be a proper lsc convex function. Then we have:*

- (i) [6, Proposition 4.1.5] *f is continuous at x if and only if $x \in \text{int} \text{dom} f$;*
- (ii) [15, Theorem 3.2.15] *$\text{int} \text{dom} f \subset \text{dom} \partial f$;*
- (iii) [15, Proposition 3.2.17] *$x \in \arg \min f$ if and only if $0 \in \partial f(x)$;*
- (iv) [15, Exercise 4.2.15] *∂f is maximally monotone;*
- (v) [3, Fact 3.1] (see [14, Proposition 2.2] for finite dimensions) *∂f is paramonotone;*
- (vi) [15, Proposition 5.31] *For any $x \in X$, we have the equivalence*

$$x^* \in \partial f(x) \Leftrightarrow f^*(x^*) + f(x) = \langle x, x^* \rangle;$$

(indeed, this statement does not require convexity);

(vii) [15, Theorem 3.4.2] (see also [19, Theorem 3]) *Let $g : X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ be any proper convex function. If $(\text{int} \text{dom} f) \cap \text{dom} g \neq \emptyset$, then we have the subdifferential sum rule*

$$\partial f(x) + \partial g(x) = \partial(f + g)(x), \text{ whenever } x \in \text{dom} \partial f \cap \text{dom} \partial g,$$

(indeed, ‘ \supset ’ is the nontrivial inclusion, as $\partial f(x) + \partial g(x) \subset \partial(f + g)(x)$ comes directly from the definition of subdifferential; moreover, the lower semicontinuity of f is not needed).

Recall that, for an arbitrary monotone operator $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$, an lsc convex function $h : X \times X^* \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ is said to be a *representative function* of T if

$$h(x, x^*) \begin{cases} = \langle x, x^* \rangle, & \text{if } (x, x^*) \in \text{gph } T, \\ > \langle x, x^* \rangle, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} .$$

Operators for which a representative function exists are called representable monotone. For a detailed study of representable monotone operators we refer to [16], where this notion was introduced.

Remark 3 From Theorem 2(vi), observe that, if $f : X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ is a proper lsc convex function, the function $h_f : X \times X^* \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ defined by

$$h_f(x, x^*) = f(x) + f^*(x^*), \text{ for } (x, x^*) \in X \times X^* \quad (11)$$

is a representative function of ∂f . More generally, every maximally monotone operator is representable, as far as its well-known Fitzpatrick function is a representative function (see, e.g. [6, Section 9.1.2] for details). An easy consequence of this fact is that intersections of arbitrary collections of maximally monotone operators are representable, too. According to [16, Corollary 32], in finite-dimensional spaces only such intersections are representable. This is no longer true in infinite dimensional spaces, as proved in [21, Theorem 11.2].

The rest of this section is devoted to recall some results about metric projections and, in order to ensure existence and uniqueness of the best approximation to closed convex sets, we assume that X is a Hilbert space. Here, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the norm associated with the corresponding inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Given any nonempty closed convex set $S \subset X$, we denote by $P_S : X \rightarrow X$ the *metric projection on S* , which assigns to each $x \in X$ its (unique) best approximation in S , denoted by $P_S(x)$, i.e., $P_S(x)$ is the unique point of S such that

$$\|x - P_S(x)\| = d(x, S) = \min \{\|x - s\| : s \in S\} .$$

(Observe that we write $P_S : X \rightarrow X$ instead $P_S : X \rightrightarrows X$ due to its single-valuedness.) It is well-known that function $x \mapsto d(x, S)$, denoted for convenience by $d_S : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$, is a continuous convex function. Recall that, for a continuous convex function, $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, applying [6, Corollary 4.2.5], we deduce that f is Gâteaux differentiable at a point x if and only if $\partial f(x)$ reduces to a singleton, i.e. $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$; see [6, Section 2] for details. In our applications, the facts that the subdifferentials $\partial d_S(x)$ or $\partial d_S^2(x)$ reduce to a singleton are crucial. Accordingly, condition (i) in the following proposition is stated directly in these terms (instead of Gâteaux differentiability). From now on, $N_S(x)$ denotes the normal cone to S at x which is given by

$$N_S(x) := \{x^* \in X^* \mid \langle s - x, x^* \rangle \leq 0, s \in S\}, \quad (12)$$

B^* denotes the closed unit ball in X^* and $\text{bd}S$ the boundary of S .

Proposition 4 *Let X be a Hilbert space and $\emptyset \neq S \subset X$ a closed set. Then, we have*

(i) [6, Corollary 4.2.5 and Theorem 4.5.7] *S is convex if and only if $\partial d_S^2(x)$ is singleton for all $x \in X$; in such a case,*

$$\nabla d_S^2(x) = 2(x - P_S(x)).$$

(ii) [15, Proposition 4.1.5] (see also [13, Section 1]) *If S is convex, then*

$$\partial d_S(x) = \begin{cases} \{0\}, & \text{if } x \in \text{int}S, \\ N_S(x) \cap B^*, & \text{if } x \in \text{bd}S, \\ \{\|x - P_S(x)\|^{-1}(x - P_S(x))\}, & \text{if } x \notin S. \end{cases}$$

3 On paramonotone and bimonotone operators

This section provides some results, appealed to in Sections 4 and 5, about operators which are simultaneously paramonotone and bimonotone on a real Banach space X . To start with, we provide some basic results on these two properties separately.

Proposition 5 *Let $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ be a representable monotone operator. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *T is paramonotone;*
- (ii) *For any representative function h of T , the following implication holds:*

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph}T \\ \langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow h(x, y^*) + h(y, x^*) = h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*). \quad (13)$$

- (iii) *There exists a representative function h of T such that (13) holds.*

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Consider any representative function of T , h , and take $(x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph}T$, with $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0$. Then, the paramonotonicity entails $y^* \in T(x)$ and $x^* \in T(y)$, yielding

$$h(x, y^*) + h(y, x^*) = \langle x, y^* \rangle + \langle y, x^* \rangle = \langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle = h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*);$$

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Straightforward.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i). Let h be a representative function of T satisfying (13). Let $x, y \in X$, $x^* \in T(x)$, $y^* \in T(y)$ and suppose $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0$. Hence,

$$h(x, y^*) + h(y, x^*) = h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*) = \langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle = \langle x, y^* \rangle + \langle y, x^* \rangle.$$

Since $h(x, y^*) \geq \langle x, y^* \rangle$ and $h(y, x^*) \geq \langle y, x^* \rangle$, these inequalities actually hold as equalities, yielding $y^* \in T(x)$ and $x^* \in T(y)$. ■

Remark 6 Observe that the paramonotonicity of the subdifferential operator ∂f of a proper lsc convex function f can be alternatively deduced from Proposition 5. Just consider the representative function h_f introduced in (11), which is separable and, hence, one always has

$$h_f(x, y^*) + h_f(y, x^*) = h_f(x, x^*) + h_f(y, y^*).$$

Other examples of paramonotone operators are mappings of the form $I - A$ where I is the identity mapping and A is nonexpansive (see [4, Theorem 6.1]); see also [14, Section 3] for the analysis of paramonotonicity of affine functions in \mathbb{R}^n .

Proposition 7 *For an operator $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) T is bimonotone;
- (ii) $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0$, whenever $(x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph}T$;
- (iii) There exist monotone operators T_1 and T_2 such that $T = T_1 \cap (-T_2)$.

Proof. (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) is trivial.

(i) \Rightarrow (iii). Write $T = T \cap (-(-T))$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i). If T_1 is monotone, so is T , since $T \subset T_1$. Analogously, since

$$-T = T_2 \cap (-T_1),$$

$-T$ is monotone, too. ■

Proposition 8 *For a representable monotone operator $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) T is bimonotone;
- (ii) For any representative function h of T , the following implication holds

$$h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*) = \langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle \Rightarrow h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*) = \langle x, y^* \rangle + \langle y, x^* \rangle. \quad (14)$$

- (iii) There exists a representative function h of T such that (14) holds.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Consider any representative function h of T , and assume that

$$h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*) = \langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle.$$

Hence, $h(x, x^*) = \langle x, x^* \rangle$ and $h(y, y^*) = \langle y, y^* \rangle$, that is, $(x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph}T$, yielding $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0$. Consequently,

$$\langle x, y^* \rangle + \langle y, x^* \rangle = \langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle = h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*).$$

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Straightforward.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i). Let $x, y \in X$, $(x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph}T$. We then have

$$h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*) = \langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle,$$

and hence $\langle x, y^* \rangle + \langle y, x^* \rangle = h(x, x^*) + h(y, y^*) = \langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle$, from which the equality $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0$ immediately follows. ■

From now on, symbol ‘ \perp ’ represents orthogonality; specifically, given any subsets $A \subset X$ and $B \subset X^*$, $A \perp B$ means that $\langle x, x^* \rangle = 0$ for any $(x, x^*) \in A \times B$, whereas $A^\perp := \{x^* \in X^* \mid \langle x, x^* \rangle = 0, \text{ for all } x \in A\}$ and $B^\perp := \{x \in X \mid \langle x, x^* \rangle = 0, \text{ for all } x^* \in B\}$.

Corollary 9 *For $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) T is paramonotone and bimonotone;
- (ii) T is monotone and constant on its domain;
- (iii) $(\text{dom } T - \text{dom } T) \perp (\text{range } T - \text{range } T)$ and $\text{gph } T = \text{dom } T \times \text{range } T$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let $x, y \in \text{dom } T$, and take $x^* \in T(x)$, $y^* \in T(y)$. By bimonotonicity, we have $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0$. Hence, by paramonotonicity, $y^* \in T(x)$ and $x^* \in T(y)$. This proves that $T(x) = T(y)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). The paramonotonicity of T is an obvious consequence of its being constant on its domain. To prove bimonotonicity, let $(x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in \text{gph } T$. Monotonicity implies $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle \geq 0$, and we can interchange x^* and y^* , since $T(x) = T(y)$; therefore $\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle = 0$.

(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) Comes from the fact that T is constant on $\text{dom } T$ if and only if $\text{gph } T = \text{dom } T \times \text{range } T$. ■

Corollary 10 *Let $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ be paramonotone and bimonotone. Then, we have*

- (i) If $\text{dom } T$ is dense in X , then T is single valued;
- (ii) If $\text{range } T$ is dense in X^* , then $\text{dom } T$ is a singleton;
- (iii) T is maximally monotone if and only if $\text{dom } T$ and $\text{range } T$ are closed affine varieties and

$$\text{dom } T - \text{dom } T = (\text{range } T - \text{range } T)^\perp. \quad (15)$$

Proof. (i) Assume, reasoning by contradiction, that there exist (x, x^*) and (x, \tilde{x}^*) in $\text{gph } T$ with $x^* \neq \tilde{x}^*$ and take $u \in X$ with $\langle u, x^* - \tilde{x}^* \rangle \neq 0$. Under the current assumption, we can take a sequence $\{x^r\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{dom } T$ converging to $x + u$. For r large enough we have $\langle x^r - x, x^* - \tilde{x}^* \rangle \neq 0$ and $x^* \in T(x) = T(x^r)$ because of Corollary 9. This contradicts (i) \Rightarrow (ii) in Proposition 7.

(ii) follows analogously to (i) by considering (x, x^*) and (\tilde{x}, x^*) in $\text{gph } T$ with $x \neq \tilde{x}$, taking again Corollary 9 into account.

(iii) Assume that T is maximally monotone. Take $x_0 \in \text{dom } T$, $x_0^* \in \text{range } T$, and let S and S_* be the linear subspaces generated by $\text{dom } T - \text{dom } T$ and $\text{range } T - \text{range } T$, respectively. Define $\hat{T} : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ by

$$\hat{T}(x) := \begin{cases} x_0^* + S^\perp & \text{if } x \in x_0 + \text{cl } S, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dom } \widehat{T} - \text{dom } \widehat{T} &= (x_0 + \text{cl } S) - (x_0 + \text{cl } S) = \text{cl } S - \text{cl } S = \text{cl } S = (S^\perp)^\perp \quad (16) \\
&= (S^\perp - S^\perp)^\perp = ((x_0^* + S^\perp) - (x_0^* + S^\perp))^\perp \quad (17) \\
&= \left(\text{range } \widehat{T} - \text{range } \widehat{T} \right)^\perp,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (15) for operator \widehat{T} . Moreover,

$$\text{gph } \widehat{T} = (x_0 + \text{cl } S) \times (x_0^* + S^\perp) = \text{dom } \widehat{T} \times \text{range } \widehat{T}.$$

Therefore, by equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) in Corollary 9, the operator \widehat{T} is paramonotone and bimonotone; in particular, \widehat{T} is monotone. On the other hand, by the same equivalence, we have

$$\text{range } T - \text{range } T \subset (\text{dom } T - \text{dom } T)^\perp = S^\perp;$$

hence $S_* \subset S^\perp$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{gph } T &= \text{dom } T \times \text{range } T \subset (x_0 + \text{cl } S) \times (x_0^* + \text{cl } S_*) \subset \text{dom } \widehat{T} \times (x_0^* + S^\perp) \quad (18) \\
&= \text{dom } \widehat{T} \times \text{range } \widehat{T} = \text{gph } \widehat{T}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the maximal monotonicity of T , we have $T = \widehat{T}$, from which we deduce that $\text{dom } T = \text{dom } \widehat{T} = x_0 + \text{cl } S$ and $\text{range } T = \text{range } \widehat{T} = x_0^* + S^\perp$, thus proving that $\text{dom } T$ and $\text{range } T$ are closed affine varieties.

Let us see the converse implication. Let $(x, x^*) \in X \times X^*$ be such that

$$\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } (y, y^*) \in \text{gph } T = \text{dom } T \times \text{range } T \quad (19)$$

(the latter equality following again from Corollary 9). Since $\text{range } T$ is an affine variety, we can easily prove that $x - y \in (\text{range } T - \text{range } T)^\perp = \text{dom } T - \text{dom } T$. More in detail, replace y^* in (19) with $x_0^* \pm \lambda v$ for any given $x_0^* \in \text{range } T$ and any $v \in \text{range } T - \text{range } T$, with $\lambda > 0$, then divide both sides of the resulting specification of (19) by λ and let $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$ to obtain $\langle x - y, \pm v \rangle \geq 0$. Therefore, given that $\text{dom } T$ is an affine variety, we deduce that $x \in \text{dom } T$. Similarly, using that $\text{range } T - \text{range } T = (\text{dom } T - \text{dom } T)^\perp$, we obtain that $x^* \in \text{range } T$. Thus, $(x, x^*) \in \text{dom } T \times \text{range } T = \text{gph } T$, which proves that T is maximally monotone. ■

The following propositions involve a finite number of paramonotone operators and are intended to provide a unified framework to deal with the applications of Sections 4 and 5. First, we introduce the following lemma, which has an easy proof.

Lemma 11 *If $T_1 : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ and $T_2 : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ are paramonotone, then so are $T_1 + T_2$ and $T_1 \cap (-T_2)$.*

Proposition 12 Let $T_i : X \rightrightarrows X^*$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, be paramonotone operators. Then the intersection mappings

$$\tilde{T}_i := T_i \cap \left(- \sum_{j \neq i} T_j \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (20)$$

are monotone and constant in their common domain

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ x \in X \mid 0 \in \sum_{j=1}^m T_j(x) \right\}.$$

Proof. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. From Lemma 11, $\sum_{j \neq i} T_j$ is paramonotone and, hence, the same lemma establishes that \tilde{T}_i is paramonotone. Then, from equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) in Proposition 7, \tilde{T}_i is bimonotone. Hence 9 (ii) yields that \tilde{T}_i is constant in $\text{dom} \tilde{T}_i$. Finally, one easily sees that $\text{dom} \tilde{T}_i$ coincides with \mathcal{A} . ■

Now, we particularize Proposition 12 by considering finitely many proper lsc convex functions, $f_i : X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and the corresponding subdifferential operators $T_i := \partial f_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. We assume the following regularity condition in order to apply the subdifferential sum rule (see Theorem 2 (vii)): there exists some index $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, such that

$$\text{dom} f_{i_0} \cap \left(\bigcap_{i \neq i_0} \text{int} \text{dom} f_i \right) \neq \emptyset, \quad (21)$$

which is equivalent to the existence of some $\bar{x} \in \bigcap_{i=1, \dots, m} \text{dom} f_i$ such that the $m-1$ of the functions f_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i_0\}$ are continuous at \bar{x} (see Theorem 2 (i)).

In this particular case, we are considering the operators

$$\tilde{T}_i := \partial f_i \cap \left(- \sum_{j \neq i} \partial f_j \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (22)$$

whose the common domain, appealing to statements (iii) and (vii) in Theorem 2, writes as

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ x \in X \mid 0 \in \sum_{i=1}^m \partial f_i(x) \right\} = \arg \min \sum_{i=1}^m f_i. \quad (23)$$

We summarize the previous comments in the following proposition.

Proposition 13 Let $f_i : X \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, be proper lsc convex functions and assume that for some $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ condition (21) holds. Then, operators \tilde{T}_i , $\{1, \dots, m\}$, defined in (22) are constant on their common domain

$$\mathcal{A} = \arg \min \sum_{i=1}^m f_i.$$

Remark 14 Proposition 13 can be applied to specific operators in order to derive some classical statements which can be found in the literature, as the one of [8, Lemma 2] involving $\partial f \cap (-N_S)$, and regarding the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && f(x) \\ & \text{subject to} && x \in C, \end{aligned}$$

in the case when $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow]-\infty, +\infty]$ is a proper lsc convex function and C is a closed convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n . Specifically, if S denotes the set of optimal solutions of such a problem, [8, Lemma 2] states that $\partial f(x) \cap (-N_C(x))$ is independent of $x \in S$. To derive this statement from Proposition 13, just observe that the normal cone operator, N_C (recall (12)), is paramonotone as it coincides with the subdifferential of the indicator function of C .

Corollary 15 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 13, one has:*

(i) *If for some $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the function f_{j_0} is differentiable at $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\tilde{T}_{j_0}(x) = \{\nabla f_{j_0}(\bar{x})\}$, for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$.*

(ii) *If for some $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the function f_{j_0} is differentiable on \mathcal{A} , then ∇f_{j_0} is constant on \mathcal{A} .*

Proof. (i) follows straightforwardly from Proposition 13, taking into account that if f_{j_0} is differentiable at \bar{x} , then $\tilde{T}_{j_0}(\bar{x}) = \partial f_{j_0}(\bar{x}) = \{\nabla f_{j_0}(\bar{x})\}$ (since $\emptyset \neq \tilde{T}_{j_0}(\bar{x}) \subset \{\nabla f_{j_0}(\bar{x})\}$), which entails that $\tilde{T}_{j_0}(x) = \tilde{T}_{j_0}(\bar{x}) = \{\nabla f_{j_0}(\bar{x})\}$ whenever $x \in \mathcal{A}$.

(ii) comes from (i) since for every $\bar{x}, x \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\{\nabla f_{j_0}(\bar{x})\} = \tilde{T}_{j_0}(x) \subset \partial f_{j_0}(x) = \{\nabla f_{j_0}(x)\};$$

hence $\nabla f_{j_0}(\bar{x}) = \nabla f_{j_0}(x)$. ■

4 Simultaneous projections and displacement mappings

This section is mainly devoted to study the minimal weighted distance to two disjoint non-empty closed and convex subsets S_1 and S_2 of a Hilbert space X . We will denote by $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the *distance function* on X , i.e., $d(x, y) := \|x - y\|$, and by $d_{S_i} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the distance function to S_i , $i = 1, 2$. We set

$$d(S_1, S_2) := \inf_{s_1 \in S_1, s_2 \in S_2} d(s_1, s_2).$$

For arbitrary real numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$, with $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$, and $p \geq 1$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} v(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p) &:= \inf_{x \in X} \alpha_1 d(x, S_1)^p + \alpha_2 d(x, S_2)^p, \\ \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p) &:= \arg \min \alpha_1 d_{S_1}^p + \alpha_2 d_{S_2}^p. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Observe that $v(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$ and $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$ are the optimal value and the set of optimal solutions of problem (4) for the case of two sets. Notice that $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$ may be empty; consider, e.g., the case when $X := \mathbb{R}^2$, S_1 is the convex hull of a branch of a hyperbola and S_2 is one of its asymptotes; in this case $v(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p) = 0$ is not attained.

We denote by $P_1 := P_{S_1}$ and $P_2 := P_{S_2}$ the metric projections over S_1 and S_2 , respectively. We distinguish several cases depending on the values of the power p and parameters α_1 and α_2 . At this moment we advance that in the case when $d_{S_1}^p$ and $d_{S_2}^p$ are differentiable we are able to apply Corollary 15 to derive information about $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$. Going further, Proposition 4(i) establishes the differentiability of $d_{S_i}^p$ on the whole space X when $p \geq 2$, which allows us to tackle the case of a finite amount of sets.

Case 1. $p := 1, \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$. The following result has a clear geometrical meaning according to Proposition 1.

Proposition 16 *If $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$, then $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1) = \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$.*

Proof. We start by proving that every $x \in X$ satisfies a useful inequality:

$$\alpha_1 d(P_1(x), S_1) + \alpha_2 d(P_1(x), S_2) = \alpha_2 d(P_1(x), S_2) \quad (25)$$

$$\leq \alpha_2 (\|P_1(x) - x\| + d(x, S_2)) \quad (26)$$

$$= \alpha_2 (d(x, S_1) + d(x, S_2)) \quad (27)$$

$$\leq \alpha_1 d(x, S_1) + \alpha_2 d(x, S_2).$$

Since the latter inequality is strict when $x \notin S_1$, it follows that $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1) \subset S_1$. To prove the inclusion $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1) \subset \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$, let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1)$ and $x \in S_1$. Since $\bar{x} \in S_1$, we have

$$\alpha_2 d(\bar{x}, S_2) = \alpha_1 d(\bar{x}, S_1) + \alpha_2 d(\bar{x}, S_2) \leq \alpha_1 d(x, S_1) + \alpha_2 d(x, S_2) = \alpha_2 d(x, S_2),$$

which shows that $\bar{x} \in \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$, thus proving the desired inclusion. For the opposite inclusion, let $\bar{x} \in \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$ and $x \in X$. Then

$$\alpha_1 d(\bar{x}, S_1) + \alpha_2 d(\bar{x}, S_2) = \alpha_2 d(\bar{x}, S_2) \leq \alpha_2 d(P_1(x), S_2) \quad (28)$$

$$= \alpha_1 d(P_1(x), S_1) + \alpha_2 d(P_1(x), S_2) \quad (29)$$

$$\leq \alpha_1 d(x, S_1) + \alpha_2 d(x, S_2),$$

which implies that $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1)$. Therefore $\arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2} \subset \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1)$, so the equality in the statement is proved. ■

In the following corollary, $\Pi_1 : S_1 \times S_2 \rightarrow S_1$ denotes de projection mapping, defined by $\Pi_1(s_1, s_2) = s_1$.

Corollary 17 *If $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$, then $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 1) = \Pi_1(\arg \min_{S_1 \times S_2} d)$*

Proof. Taking into account Proposition 16, we will actually prove the equivalent equality $\arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2} = \Pi_1(\arg \min_{S_1 \times S_2} d)$. To prove the inclusion \subset , let $\bar{s}_1 \in \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$ and $s_1 \in S_1$. Then, for every $s_2 \in S_2$, we have

$$d(\bar{s}_1, P_2(\bar{s}_1)) = d(\bar{s}_1, S_2) \leq d(s_1, S_2) \leq d(s_1, s_2);$$

hence $(\bar{s}_1, P_2(\bar{s}_1)) \in \arg \min_{S_1 \times S_2} d$, implying that $\bar{s}_1 \in \Pi_1(\arg \min_{S_1 \times S_2} d)$, thus proving the desired inclusion. We now proceed to prove the opposite inclusion. Let $\bar{s}_1 \in \Pi_1(\arg \min_{S_1 \times S_2} d)$ and $s_1 \in S_1$. There exists $\bar{s}_2 \in S_2$ such that $(\bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2) \in \arg \min_{S_1 \times S_2} d$, and for every $s_2 \in S_2$ we have

$$d(\bar{s}_1, S_2) \leq d(\bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2) \leq d(s_1, s_2);$$

taking infimum over $s_2 \in S_2$, this yields $d(\bar{s}_1, S_2) \leq d(s_1, S_2)$, which implies that $\bar{s}_1 \in \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$. Thus $\Pi_1(\arg \min_{S_1 \times S_2} d) \subset \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$, and the proof is complete. ■

Case 2. $p = 1$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \frac{1}{2}$. From now on $]P_1(x), P_2(x)[$ represents the segment of points between $P_1(x)$ and $P_2(x)$, except these two ones; i.e., $]P_1(x), P_2(x)[:= \{(1 - \lambda)P_1(x) + \lambda P_2(x) : 0 < \lambda < 1\}$.

Proposition 18 *One has:*

$$(i) v(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1) = \frac{1}{2}d(S_1, S_2),$$

$$(ii) \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1) = \{x \in X : x \in]P_1(x), P_2(x)[\} \cup \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2} \cup \arg \min_{S_2} d_{S_1}.$$

Proof. (i) For $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, S_1) + d(x, S_2) &= \|x - P_1(x)\| + \|x - P_2(x)\| \geq \|P_1(x) - P_2(x)\| \quad (30) \\ &\geq d(S_1, S_2), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the inequality \geq . To prove the opposite inequality, it suffices to observe that, for $s_1 \in S_1$ and $s_2 \in S_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_1 - s_2\| &= d(s_1, S_1) + \|s_1 - s_2\| \geq d(s_1, S_1) + d(s_1, S_2) \quad (31) \\ &\geq 2v(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Let $x \in \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1)$. If $x \notin S_1 \cup S_2$, then $x \in]P_1(x), P_2(x)[$, since otherwise we would have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, S_1) + d(x, S_2) &= \|x - P_1(x)\| + \|x - P_2(x)\| > \|P_1(x) - P_2(x)\| \quad (32) \\ &\geq d(S_1, S_2), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction with (i). If $x \in S_1$, then, for any $s_1 \in S_1$ we have

$$d(x, S_2) = d(x, S_1) + d(x, S_2) \leq d(s_1, S_1) + d(s_1, S_2) = d(s_1, S_2),$$

which shows that $x \in \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$. In the same way, if $x \in S_2$, then $x \in \arg \min_{S_2} d_{S_1}$. We have thus proved the inclusion \subset . To prove the opposite

inclusion, let $x \in X$ be such that $x \in]P_1(x), P_2(x)[$ and take $\lambda \in]0, 1[$ such that $x = (1 - \lambda)P_1(x) + \lambda P_2(x)$. Combining this equality with the inequalities $\langle s_i - P_i(x), x - P_i(x) \rangle \leq 0$, which hold for every $s_i \in S_i$, we obtain $\langle s_1 - P_1(x), P_2(x) - P_1(x) \rangle \leq 0$ and $\langle s_2 - P_2(x), P_1(x) - P_2(x) \rangle \leq 0$. Adding the latter inequalities, we get $\langle s_2 - s_1 + P_1(x) - P_2(x), P_1(x) - P_2(x) \rangle \leq 0$; hence

$$\|P_1(x) - P_2(x)\|^2 \leq \langle s_1 - s_2, P_1(x) - P_2(x) \rangle \leq \|s_1 - s_2\| \|P_1(x) - P_2(x)\|.$$

Therefore, $\|s_1 - s_2\| \geq \|P_1(x) - P_2(x)\|$, and we deduce that

$$d(x, S_1) + d(x, S_2) = \|x - P_1(x)\| + \|x - P_2(x)\| = \|P_1(x) - P_2(x)\| \leq \|s_1 - s_2\|.$$

Since $s_i \in S_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are arbitrarily chosen, we conclude

$$d(x, S_1) + d(x, S_2) \leq d(S_1, S_2),$$

which, by (i), says that $x \in \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1)$. It remains to prove that

$$\arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2} \cup \arg \min_{S_2} d_{S_1} \subset \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1).$$

For symmetry reasons, it suffices to prove that $\arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2} \subset \mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1)$, but this inclusion follows from the fact that, for $x \in \arg \min_{S_1} d_{S_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, S_1) + d(x, S_2) &= d(x, S_2) = \min_{s_1 \in S_1} d(s_1, S_2) = \min_{s_1 \in S_1} \min_{s_2 \in S_2} d(s_1, s_2) \quad (33) \\ &= \min_{s_1 \in S_1, s_2 \in S_2} d(s_1, s_2) = d(S_1, S_2). \end{aligned}$$

■

Case 3. $p > 1$.

In our current setting, it is known that function $d_{S_i} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and differentiable outside S_i and for every $x \in X \setminus S_i$ one has (recall Proposition 4(ii))

$$\nabla d_{S_i}(x) = (x - P_i(x)) / \|x - P_i(x)\|. \quad (34)$$

Theorem 19 *If $p > 1$, then:*

- (i) $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p) \cap (S_1 \cup S_2) = \emptyset$.
- (ii) For each $i = 1, 2$, function $d_{S_i}^p$ is differentiable in $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$ and

$$\nabla d_{S_i}^p(x) = p \|x - P_i(x)\|^{p-2} (x - P_i(x)), \quad x \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p).$$

- (iii) $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$ coincides with the set of fixed points of

$$\frac{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_1 + \frac{\alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_2.$$

Proof. (i) It will suffice to prove that $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p) \cap S_1 = \emptyset$. Let $x \in S_1$ and pick $\lambda > 0$ such that $\frac{\lambda^p}{1-(1-\lambda)^p} < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}$ (this is possible, since $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\lambda^p}{1-(1-\lambda)^p} = 0$). Since

$$d((1-\lambda)x + \lambda P_2(x), S_1) \leq d((1-\lambda)x + \lambda P_2(x), x) = \lambda \|P_2(x) - x\|$$

and

$$d((1-\lambda)x + \lambda P_2(x), S_2) \leq d((1-\lambda)x + \lambda P_2(x), P_2(x)) = (1-\lambda) \|x - P_2(x)\|,$$

we have

$$\alpha_1 d((1-\lambda)x + \lambda P_2(x), S_1)^p + \alpha_2 d((1-\lambda)x + \lambda P_2(x), S_2)^p \quad (35)$$

$$\leq \alpha_1 \lambda^p \|P_2(x) - x\|^p + \alpha_2 (1-\lambda)^p \|x - P_2(x)\|^p \quad (36)$$

$$= (\alpha_1 \lambda^p + \alpha_2 (1-\lambda)^p) \|x - P_2(x)\|^p < \alpha_2 \|x - P_2(x)\|^p \quad (37)$$

$$= \alpha_1 d(x, S_1)^p + \alpha_2 d(x, S_2)^p,$$

which shows that $x \notin \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$, thus proving that $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$ and S_1 are disjoint.

(ii) is a consequence of (i) taking (34) into account.

(iii) For simplicity of notation, for $x \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$ and $i = 1, 2$ we will denote

$$D_i^p(x) := \alpha_i \nabla d_{S_i}^p(x). \quad (38)$$

Let $x \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$. The equality $D_1^p(x) + D_2^p(x) = 0$ yields

$$\alpha_1 \|x - P_1(x)\|^{p-2} (x - P_1(x)) + \alpha_2 \|x - P_2(x)\|^{p-2} (x - P_2(x)) = 0, \quad (39)$$

from which we deduce that

$$x = \frac{\alpha_1 \|x - P_1(x)\|^{p-2}}{\alpha_1 \|x - P_1(x)\|^{p-2} + \alpha_2 \|x - P_2(x)\|^{p-2}} P_1(x) \quad (40)$$

$$+ \frac{\alpha_2 \|x - P_2(x)\|^{p-2}}{\alpha_1 \|x - P_1(x)\|^{p-2} + \alpha_2 \|x - P_2(x)\|^{p-2}} P_2(x) \quad (41)$$

$$= \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \left(\frac{\|x - P_2(x)\|}{\|x - P_1(x)\|} \right)^{p-2}} P_1(x) + \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1 \left(\frac{\|x - P_1(x)\|}{\|x - P_2(x)\|} \right)^{p-2} + \alpha_2} P_2(x)$$

Since condition $D_1^p(x) + D_2^p(x) = 0$ implies that $\|D_1^p(x)\| = \|D_2^p(x)\|$, that is, $\alpha_1 p \|x - P_1(x)\|^{p-1} = \alpha_2 p \|x - P_2(x)\|^{p-1}$, which is equivalent to the equality

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} = \left(\frac{\|x - P_2(x)\|}{\|x - P_1(x)\|} \right)^{p-1}, \quad (42)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
x &= \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}} P_1(x) + \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1 \left(\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}\right)^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}} + \alpha_2} P_2(x) \\
&= \frac{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_1(x) + \frac{\alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_2(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

This shows that x is a fixed point of $\frac{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_1 + \frac{\alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_2$.

Conversely, if $x \in X$ is a fixed point of $\frac{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_1 + \frac{\alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_2$, then $x \notin S_1 \cup S_2$. Indeed, otherwise, if, say, $x \in S_1$, then, from the equalities

$$x = \frac{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_1(x) + \frac{\alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} P_2(x) \tag{44}$$

and $P_1(x) = x$ we would obtain $x = P_2(x) \in S_2$, thus contradicting the assumption that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$. Therefore, the functions d_{S_i} , $i = 1, 2$, are differentiable at x . From (44), it follows that

$$\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p-1}} (x - P_1(x)) + \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p-1}} (x - P_2(x)) = 0, \tag{45}$$

from which we deduce (42). Now, using (42), we can rewrite (45) as (39) to obtain the equality $D_1^p(x) + D_2^p(x) = 0$, which shows that $x \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, p)$. ■

Notice that the set $\mathcal{A}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, p)$ does not depend on p , since, by Theorem 19(iii), it coincides with the set of fixed points of $\frac{1}{2}(P_1 + P_2)$. Also notice that $\mathcal{A}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, 2)$ coincides with the set of fixed points of $\alpha_1 P_1 + \alpha_2 P_2$.

The following lemma provides the counterpart of Theorem 19(ii) for the case $p \geq 2$.

Lemma 20 *Take $p \geq 2$, and let $\emptyset \neq S \subset X$ be a closed convex set. The function d_S^p is differentiable in X and we have*

$$\nabla d_S^p(x) = p d_S^{p-2}(x) (x - P_S(x)), \text{ for } x \in X.$$

Proof. Just write $d_S^p(x)$ as $(d_S^2(x))^{p/2}$ and apply Proposition 4 (i). ■

The fact that function d_S^p is differentiable in the whole space X enables us to tackle the case of a finite amount of subsets S_1, \dots, S_m , with $\bigcap_{i=1}^m S_i = \emptyset$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For simplicity, we use the notation

$$\mathcal{A}(\alpha, p) := \arg \min \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i d_{S_i}^p, \tag{46}$$

where $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m)$, with $\alpha_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 1$. The following theorem gathers the announced application of Corollary 15(ii).

Theorem 21 *If $p > 1$ and $m = 2$, or $p \geq 2$, the displacement mappings $I - P_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ are constant on $\mathcal{A}(\alpha, p)$.*

Proof. From Theorem 19(ii) and Lemma 20 if any of the current cases occurs we have that $d_{S_i}^p$ is differentiable on $\mathcal{A}(\alpha, p)$, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$. Hence, by Corollary 15(ii),

$$\nabla d_{S_i}^p(x) = p \|x - P_i(x)\|^{p-2} (x - P_i(x)) \quad (47)$$

is constant on $\mathcal{A}(\alpha, p)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$ (again, $P_i := P_{S_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$). So,

$$\|\nabla d_{S_i}^p(x)\| = p \|x - P_i(x)\|^{p-1}$$

is constant on $\mathcal{A}(\alpha, p)$, too, and hence so is $\|x - P_i(x)\|$. Therefore, from (47), we conclude that $I - P_i$ is constant on $\mathcal{A}(\alpha, p)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. ■

As a consequence of the previous theorem, taking Proposition 1 into account, we derive the following corollary. Roughly speaking, under the current assumptions, the corollary says that the smallest translations of the sets S_i that achieve a nonempty intersection are unique.

Corollary 22 *If $p > 1$ and $m = 2$, or $p \geq 2$, problem (5) has a unique optimal solution, provided that problem (4) is solvable.*

5 Distance to feasibility

This section is focused on the distance to feasibility for convex inequality systems in \mathbb{R}^n under RHS perturbations. In this framework, lower and upper estimates for such a distance are provided in terms of some elements whose existence is guaranteed from Corollary 15. Both estimates coincide when confined to linear systems.

Let us consider the parameterized system,

$$\sigma(b) := \{g_i(x) \leq b_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}, \quad (48)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(b_i)_{i=1, \dots, m} \equiv b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. To start with, the space of variables, \mathbb{R}^n , is endowed with an arbitrary norm, $\|\cdot\|$, with dual norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ and the associated distances denoted by d and d_* , respectively. From Corollary 27 on we consider \mathbb{R}^n equipped with the Euclidean norm, $\|\cdot\|_2$. The space of parameters, \mathbb{R}^m , is endowed with any p -norm, $\|\cdot\|_p$, provided that $p \geq 2$, and the associated distance is denoted by d_p . We denote by Θ_c the set of consistent parameters; i.e.,

$$\Theta_c := \{b \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \sigma(b) \text{ is consistent}\}.$$

Throughout this section we consider a fixed $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Theta_c$ and our aim is to estimate

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c) = \inf \left\{ \|\bar{b} - b\|_p : b \in \text{is consistent} \right\},$$

called the distance from \bar{b} to feasibility.

Proposition 23 *Let $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Theta_c$, then*

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c)^p = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p.$$

Proof. To establish the inequality ' \leq ', take any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and define

$$b_i := \bar{b}_i + [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

One can easily check that $b = (b_i)_{i=1, \dots, m} \in \Theta_c$ and, hence,

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c)^p \leq d_p(\bar{b}, b)^p = \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p.$$

Since $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has been arbitrarily chosen, then

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c)^p \leq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p.$$

Let us prove the converse inequality. Take any $b \in \Theta_c$, i.e., such that, for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $g_i(\bar{x}) \leq b_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$; then, $g_i(\bar{x}) - \bar{b}_i \leq b_i - \bar{b}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and so

$$[g_i(\bar{x}) - \bar{b}_i]_+ \leq [b_i - \bar{b}_i]_+ \leq |b_i - \bar{b}_i|, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Hence

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(\bar{x}) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p \leq \|\bar{b} - b\|_p^p.$$

Since the previous inequality is held for all $b \in \Theta_c$, then $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p \leq d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c)^p$. ■

The well-known Ascoli formula establishes that the distance from a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to a half-space $H := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle a, x \rangle \leq b\}$, with $0_n \neq a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$, is given by

$$d_H(x) = \frac{[\langle a, x \rangle - b]_+}{\|a\|_*}. \quad (49)$$

The following result is focused on the extension of (49) to the convex case, where a convex inequality of the form ' $g(x) \leq b$ ' is considered. In this context, the distance from $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to the nonempty closed convex set $S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g(x) \leq b\}$, denoted by $d_S(x)$, is lower and upper bounded by quotients involving the residual $[g(x) - b]_+$ and the minimum norm of some subgradients of g . Regarding these quotients, we use the convention $\frac{0}{0} := 0$.

Proposition 24 Let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the corresponding sublevel set, S , is nonempty. Then we have:

(i) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$d_S(x) \geq \frac{[g(x) - b]_+}{d_*(0_n, \partial g(x))};$$

(ii) Assume that there exists $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (called a Slater point) such that $g(\hat{x}) < b$. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$d_S(x) \leq \frac{[g(x) - b]_+}{d_*(0_n, \partial g(P_S(x)))},$$

where $P_S(x)$ is the metric projection set of x on S with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Proof. (i) Inequality $g(x) \leq b$ turns out to be equivalent (same solution set, S) to its standard linearization by means of the Fenchel conjugate, g^* , (see, e.g., [5, Formula (3)]), namely system

$$\{\langle u, x \rangle \leq g^*(u) + b, u \in \partial g(\mathbb{R}^n)\}.$$

The distance $d_S(x)$ may be computed by means of [10, Lemma 1], yielding (with the convention $\frac{0}{0} := 0$)

$$d_S(x) = \sup \left\{ \frac{[\langle v, x \rangle - \alpha]_+}{\|v\|_*} \mid (v, \alpha) \in \text{conv} \{(u, g^*(u) + b), u \in \partial g(\mathbb{R}^n)\} \right\} \quad (50)$$

$$\geq \sup \left\{ \frac{[\langle u, x \rangle - (g^*(u) + b)]_+}{\|u\|_*} \mid u \in \partial g(\mathbb{R}^n) \right\} \quad (51)$$

$$\geq \sup \left\{ \frac{[g(x) - b]_+}{\|u\|_*} \mid u \in \partial g(x) \right\} \quad (52)$$

$$= \frac{[g(x) - b]_+}{\inf \{\|u\|_* \mid u \in \partial g(x)\}} = \frac{[g(x) - b]_+}{d_*(0_n, \partial g(x))},$$

where in the third step we have appealed to the fact that

$$g(x) = g^{**}(x) = \langle u, x \rangle - g^*(u) \Leftrightarrow u \in \partial g(x).$$

(ii) It follows from [11, Lemma 2(ii)]. Observe that for $x \in S$ we apply the convention $\frac{0}{0} := 0$, whereas for $x \notin S$ the existence of a Slater point entails that $P_S(x)$ is not a minimizer of g (since $g(P_S(x)) = 0$), and then $d_*(0_n, \partial g(P_S(x))) > 0$. ■

Remark 25 In many cases it is not difficult to see that

$$b \mapsto \delta(b) := d_*(0_n, \partial g(g^{-1}(b)))$$

is a positive nondecreasing function on the interval $[\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} g, +\infty[$ (we are assuming the nontrivial case when g is not constant, hence not bounded above). Here $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} g$ could be $-\infty$ and $\partial g(g^{-1}(b)) = \bigcup_{g(y)=b} \partial g(y)$. For instance, if $g(x_1, x_2) = e^{x_1} + e^{x_2}$, with the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^2 , then $\delta(b) = b/\sqrt{2}$ for $b > 0$. Accordingly, item (ii) in the previous lemma entails $d_S(x) \leq [g(x) - b]_+/\delta(b)$.

Corollary 26 Let $\bar{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Theta_c$ and assume that $S_i := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g_i(x) \leq \bar{b}_i\} \neq \emptyset$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then, the following statements hold:

(i) Let $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed convex set such that, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, there exists an upper bound $u_i \geq d_*(0_n, \partial g_i(x))$ for all $x \in C$. Then,

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c)^p \leq \inf_{x \in C} \sum_{i=1}^m (u_i)^p d_{S_i}^p(x) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^m (u_i)^p d_{S_i}^p(x) + I_C(x), \quad (53)$$

where I_C is the indicator function of C ; i.e., $I_C(x) = 0$ if $x \in C$ and $I_C(x) = +\infty$ if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus C$.

(ii) Assume that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ there exists a lower bound $0 < l_i \leq d_*(0_n, \partial g_i(P_{S_i}(x)))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus S_i$. Then,

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c)^p \geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^m (l_i)^p d_{S_i}^p(x). \quad (54)$$

Proof. (i) comes straightforwardly from Propositions 23 and 24 (i), taking into account the obvious fact that $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p \leq \inf_{x \in C} \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p$.

(ii) follows immediately from Propositions 23 and 24 (ii). ■

Provided that C , $u = (u_i)_{i=1, \dots, m}$, $l = (l_i)_{i=1, \dots, m}$ satisfy the conditions of the previous corollary, we consider the argmin sets coming from (53) and (54):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(C, u) &:= \arg \min \sum_{i=1}^m (u_i)^p d_{S_i}^p(x) + I_C(x), \\ \mathcal{A}(l) &:= \arg \min \sum_{i=1}^m (l_i)^p d_{S_i}^p(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then we can state another corollary of Proposition 24, appealing also to Corollary 15. Indeed, it brings to light the advantages of appealing to $\mathcal{A}(C, u)$ and $\mathcal{A}(l)$, instead of working directly with $\arg \min \sum_{i=1}^m [g_i(x) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p$. The key point is that, in the current case in which $p \geq 2$, each function $d_{S_i}^p$ is differentiable in \mathbb{R}^n (see Lemma 20), which allows to appeal to Corollary 15, while this is not the case of $[g_i(\cdot) - \bar{b}_i]_+^p$.

Hereafter in this section we consider that \mathbb{R}^n is endowed with the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $P_S(x)$ will denote the unique projection point of x on a closed convex set S .

Corollary 27 Keeping the previous notation, assume that $\mathcal{A}(C, u)$ and $\mathcal{A}(l)$ are nonempty. Then, we have that:

(i) d_{S_i} is constant on both $\mathcal{A}(C, u)$ and $\mathcal{A}(l)$, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$;

(ii) For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, let us denote by d_i^+ and d_i^- the constant values of $u_i d_{S_i}(\cdot)$ and $l_i d_{S_i}(\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{A}(C, u)$ and $\mathcal{A}(l)$, respectively, and let $d^+ = (d_i^+)_{i=1, \dots, m}$ and $d^- = (d_i^-)_{i=1, \dots, m}$. Then,

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c) \leq \|d^+\|_p.$$

If, in addition, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ there exists $\widehat{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $g_i(\widehat{x}_i) < \bar{b}_i$, then

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c) \geq \|d^-\|_p.$$

Proof. (i) Regarding $\mathcal{A}(l)$, the statement coincides with the one of Theorem 21 (in the case when $p \geq 2$) just replacing each α_i with $(l_i)^p$. With respect to $\mathcal{A}(C, u)$, the statement comes from an analogous argument to the one of that theorem, just by adding the nondifferentiable mapping I_C . For completeness, we include here a sketch of the proof. Observe that all functions $x \mapsto (u_i)^p d_{S_i}^p(x)$ are convex and differentiable in \mathbb{R}^n , and $x \mapsto I_C(x)$ is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function from \mathbb{R}^n to $] -\infty, +\infty]$. Hence, the regularity condition (21) is satisfied, yielding

$$\mathcal{A}(C, u) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 0_n \in \sum_{i=1}^m (u_i)^p \nabla d_{S_i}^p(x) + \partial I_C(x) \right\} (\neq \emptyset).$$

From Corollary 15, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$, we have that $\nabla d_{S_i}^p$ is constant on $\mathcal{A}(C, u)$, hence d_{S_i} is also constant on $\mathcal{A}(C, u)$ since taking norms we have

$$\|\nabla d_{S_i}^p(x)\| = \left\| p d_{S_i}^{p-2}(x)(x - P_i(x)) \right\| = p d_{S_i}^{p-1}(x), \text{ for each } x \in \mathcal{A}(C, u),$$

where $P_i(x)$ denotes the projection of x on S_i (recall again Lemma 20).

(ii) follows immediately from (i) and Corollary 26. ■

5.1 Linear systems

This subsection is devoted to the linear case, i.e., where $g_i(x) = \langle a_i, x \rangle$, for some $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. In this particular case, obviously $\partial g_i(x) = \{a_i\}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let us consider \bar{b} such that

$$\sigma(\bar{b}) = \{ \langle a_i, x \rangle \leq \bar{b}_i, i = 1, \dots, m \} \quad (55)$$

is inconsistent and for each i there exists $\widehat{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\langle a_i, \widehat{x}_i \rangle < \bar{b}_i$ (observe that it is always held when $a_i \neq 0_n$ or $\bar{b}_i > 0$). According to the notation of Corollary 26, we can choose:

$$C = \mathbb{R}^n, l_i = u_i = \|a_i\|_*, i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Hence $\mathcal{A}(C, u) = \mathcal{A}(l)$, and $d_i^+ = d_i^-$ for all i . Let us denote by $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}(C, u)$ and $\bar{d} := (d_i^+)_{i=1, \dots, m}$.

The following corollary follows straightforwardly from Corollary 27.

Corollary 28 *Under the current assumptions, we have*

$$d_p(\bar{b}, \Theta_c) = \|\bar{d}\|_p,$$

where $d_i^+ = \|a_i\|_* d_{S_i}(x) = [\langle a_i, x \rangle - \bar{b}_i]_+$, for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$. Moreover $\sigma(\bar{b} + \bar{d})$ is a consistent system nearest to $\sigma(\bar{b})$.

The next result is devoted to provide an operative expression for determining \bar{d} with the Euclidean norm in both the space of variables and the space of parameters. For simplicity all norms are denoted by $\|\cdot\|$, A represents the matrix whose rows are a'_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, A' denotes its transpose and, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $[y]_+$ denotes positive part coordinate by coordinate; i.e.,

$$[y]_+ := ([y_i]_+)_{i=1, \dots, m}.$$

Theorem 29 *The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $(x^0, h^0) \in \mathcal{A} \times \{\bar{d}\}$;
- (ii) (x^0, h^0) is a solution of the system, in the variable (x, h) ,

$$\begin{cases} [Ax - \bar{b}]_+ = h, \\ A'h = 0_n. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

- (iii) (x^0, h^0) is an optimal solution of the quadratic problem, in the variable (x, h) ,

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \langle h, h \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax \leq \bar{b} + h, \\ & h \geq 0_m. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Proof. Let us see (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let $(x^0, h^0) \in \mathcal{A} \times \{\bar{d}\}$, i.e., $x^0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $h^0 = \bar{d}$. By Corollary 28, $h_i^0 (= d_i^+) = [a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i]_+$, for all i . Moreover, the optimality condition

$$x^0 \in \mathcal{A} := \arg \min \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|^2 d_{S_i}^2(x)$$

is equivalent to

$$0_n = \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|^2 \nabla d_{S_i}^2(x^0) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\| d_{S_i}(x^0) a_i = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m [a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i]_+ a_i; \quad (58)$$

in other words

$$0_n = \sum_{i=1}^m h_i^0 a_i = A'h^0.$$

So, (x^0, h^0) is a solution of system (56).

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Let (x^0, h^0) be a solution of (56); i.e., $h^0 = [Ax^0 - \bar{b}]_+$ and

$$0_n = \sum_{i=1}^m h_i^0 a_i = A'h^0.$$

Then, by repeating the previous argument of (58), we have

$$0_n = \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|^2 \nabla d_{S_i}^2(x^0),$$

which means that $x^0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, appealing again to Corollary 28, we deduce $h^0 = \bar{d}$.

Now, let us prove (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii). By the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT, in brief) conditions, (x^0, h^0) is an optimal solution of (57) if and only if there exist $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\begin{pmatrix} 0_n \\ 2h^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A' \\ -I_m \end{pmatrix} \lambda + \begin{pmatrix} 0_{n \times m} \\ -I_m \end{pmatrix} \mu, \\ (Ax^0 - \bar{b} - h^0)' \lambda = 0, \quad -(h^0)' \mu = 0, \\ Ax^0 - \bar{b} - h^0 \leq 0_m, \quad h^0 \geq 0_m. \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

So, $A'\lambda = 0_n$, and $h^0 = \frac{\lambda + \mu}{2}$. Moreover, $h_i^0 \mu_i = 0$ for all i . Let us see that $\mu = 0_m$. If $h_i^0 = 0$, then $\lambda_i + \mu_i = 0$, which entails $\lambda_i = \mu_i = 0$, while, if $h_i^0 > 0$, then $\mu_i = 0$. Therefore

$$h^0 = \frac{\lambda}{2} \quad (60)$$

and, so,

$$A'h^0 = 0_n.$$

Let us see that $[Ax^0 - \bar{b}]_+ = h^0$. Observe that $(a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i - h_i^0) \lambda_i = 0$ for all i . If $a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i < 0$, then $a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i - h_i^0 < 0$, thus we have $\lambda_i = 0$ and

$$h_i^0 = \frac{\lambda_i}{2} = 0.$$

If $a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i > 0$, then $h_i^0 > 0$ and $\lambda_i > 0$, yielding $a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i - h_i^0 = 0$. Finally, if $a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i = 0$, then $h_i^0 \lambda_i = 0$, and from (60) we have $h_i^0 = 0$. So,

$$[a'_i x^0 - \bar{b}_i]_+ = h_i^0, \text{ for all } i,$$

and consequently (x^0, h^0) is a solution of (56).

Reciprocally, if (x^0, h^0) is a solution of (56) and we consider

$$\lambda = 2h^0 \text{ and } \mu = 0_m,$$

it can be easily seen that x^0, h^0, λ and μ satisfy the KKT conditions (59), and then (x^0, h^0) is an optimal solution for problem (57). ■

References

- [1] H.H. BAUSCHKE, P. L. COMBETTES, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, Springer, New York, 2011.
- [2] H.H. BAUSCHKE, P. L. COMBETTES, D.R. LUKE, *Finding best approximation pairs relative to closed convex sets in Hilbert spaces*, Journal of Approximation Theory 125 (2004), 178-192.

- [3] H.H. BAUSCHE, X. WANG, YAO, *On Borwein–Wiersma decompositions of monotone linear relations*, SIAM J. Optim. 20 (2010), 2636–2652.
- [4] H.H. BAUSCHKE, X. WANG, L. YAO, *Rectangularity and paramonotonicity of maximally monotone operators*, Optimization, 63 (2014), 487-504.
- [5] G. BEER, M.J. CÁNOVAS, M.A. LÓPEZ, J. PARRA, *Lipschitz modulus of linear and convex inequality systems with the Hausdorff metric*, Math. Program. 189 (2021), pp. 75–98.
- [6] J.M. BORWEIN, J.D. VANDERWERFF, *Convex Functions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2010.
- [7] R. S. BURACHIK, A. N. IUSEM, *Set-valued mappings and enlargement of monotone operators*, Springer, New York, 2009.
- [8] J.V. BURKE, M.C. FERRIS, *Characterization of solution sets of convex programs*, Oper. Res. Lett. 10 (1991), 57-60.
- [9] R.E. BRUCK, *An iterative solution of a variational inequality for certain monotone operators in Hilbert space*, Bull. AMS 81 (1975), 890–892.
- [10] M.J. CÁNOVAS, F.J. GÓMEZ-SENET, J. PARRA, *Regularity modulus of arbitrarily perturbed linear inequality systems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 343 (2008), pp. 315-327.
- [11] M.J. CÁNOVAS, F.J. GÓMEZ-SENET, J. PARRA, *Linear regularity, equirregularity, and intersection mappings for convex semi-infinite inequality systems*, Math. Program. Ser B, 123 (2010), 33-60.
- [12] Y. CENSOR, A.N. IUSEM, S.A. ZENIOS, *An interior point method with Bregman functions for the variational inequality problem with paramonotone operators*, Math. Program. (Series A) 81 (1998), 373–400.
- [13] R.B. HOLMES, *Smoothness of certain metric projections on Hilbert space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 184 (1973), 87-100.
- [14] A.N. IUSEM, *On some properties of paramonotone operators*, J. Convex Anal. 5 (1998), 269-278.
- [15] R. LUCCHETTI, *Convexity and Well-Posed Problems*, volume 22 of CMS Books in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006.
- [16] J. E. MARTÍNEZ-LEGAZ, B. F. SVAITER, *Monotone operators representable by l.s.c. convex functions*, Set-Valued Anal. 13 (2005), 21–46
- [17] B.S. MORDUKHOVICH, N.M. NAM, *Convex Analysis and Beyond. Volume I. Basic theory*, Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer-Verlag, Cham, 2022.

- [18] R.R. PHELPS, *Convex Functions, Monotone Operators and Differentiability*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [19] R.T. ROCKAFELLAR, *Extension of Fenchel' duality theorem for convex functions*, Duke Math. J. 33 (1966), 81-89.
- [20] R.T. ROCKAFELLAR, R.J.-B. WETS, *Variational Analysis*, 3rd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.
- [21] S. SIMONS, *Positive sets and monotone sets*, J. Convex Anal. 14 (2007) 297–317.
- [22] S. SIMONS, *From Hahn-Banach to Monotonicity*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.
- [23] C. ZĂLINESCU, *Convex Analysis in General Vector Spaces*, World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2002.