

# Convex sets approximable as the sum of a compact set and a cone

Daniel Dörfler\*      Andreas Löhne<sup>†</sup>

January 25, 2024

*Dedicated to the memory of Professor Alfred Göpfert.*

## Abstract

The class of convex sets that admit approximations as Minkowski sum of a compact convex set and a closed convex cone in the Hausdorff distance is introduced. These sets are called approximately Motzkin-decomposable and generalize the notion of Motzkin-decomposability, i.e. the representation of a set as the sum of a compact convex set and a closed convex cone. We characterize these sets in terms of their support functions and show that they coincide with hyperbolic sets, i.e. convex sets contained in the sum of their recession cone and a compact convex set, if their recession cones are polyhedral but are more restrictive in general. In particular we prove that a set is approximately Motzkin-decomposable if and only if its support function has a closed domain relative to which it is continuous.

## 1 Introduction

Consider the closed convex sets  $C^1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1 x_2 \geq 1, x_1 \geq 0\}$  and  $C^2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 \geq x_1^2\}$  with their recession cones  $0^+C^1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \geq 0\}$  and  $0^+C^2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1 = 0, x_2 \geq 0\}$ . For  $r > 0$  we understand a truncation  $C_r^i$  of these sets to be  $C_r^i = (C^i \cap rB) + 0^+C^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $B$  denotes the Euclidean unit ball. That is, we restrict  $C^i$  to a compact subset of itself given by a ball of radius  $r$  and add the recession cone afterwards, yielding a

\*daniel.doerfler@uni-jena.de, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Germany

<sup>†</sup>andreas.loehne@uni-jena.de, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Germany

subset of  $C^i$ . This situation is depicted in Figure 1. Clearly, the truncations  $C_r^1$  of  $C^1$  converge to  $C^1$  with respect to the Hausdorff distance if  $r$  tends to  $+\infty$ . However, the same is not true for  $C^2$  because, for every  $r > 0$ , the Hausdorff distance between  $C_r^2$  and  $C^2$  is infinite. Note that there is a geometric difference between  $C^1$  and  $C^2$ :  $C^1 \subseteq \{0\} + 0^+C^1$ , but there does not exist a compact set  $M$  satisfying  $C^2 \subseteq M + 0^+C^2$ . In view of this property,  $C^1$  is called hyperbolic, cf. [1, 13]. In this work we investigate the following questions regarding a closed convex set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ :

1. What characterizes the property that  $C$  can be approximated by truncations  $C_r$  in the above sense?
2. How is this property related to hyperbolicity of  $C$ ? Do both properties coincide (under certain assumptions)?




Figure 1: When can  $C$  be approximated by truncations?

This is motivated by the observation that conducting analysis on  $C$  presents various challenges in the presence of unboundedness. The above example demonstrates that the Hausdorff distance is only limitedly suitable for the comparison of unbounded sets and the recession cone may only partly capture the asymptotic behavior of  $C$ . The latter is evident from the fact that  $0^+C = 0^+C_r$  whenever  $C_r$  is nonempty. Hence, from a practical perspective, it seems favourable to reduce investigations to a bounded subset of  $C$ .

What needs to be addressed is whether it is possible to select a subset a priori in such a way as to not neglect important information about  $C$ . One class of convex sets that permit such a choice are called  $M$ -decomposable

sets and have been studied by various authors over the last decade [5, 7, 6, 17]. These are the sets that can be represented as the Minkowski sum of a compact convex set and a closed convex cone. They have been characterized in different ways, e.g. in terms of support functions and via an associated vector optimization problem and its set of efficient points [5], with regard to their extreme points [7] and in the sense of intersections of sets with certain hyperplanes [6]. Nevertheless, imposing M-decomposability on  $C$  is a strong assumption. For example, both of the sets  $C^1$  and  $C^2$  above are not M-decomposable. However, their truncations always are. Hence, the first question might be restated as:

- 1\*. When can a closed convex set  $C$  be approximated by M-decomposable sets?

To address these questions we introduce and study the class of approximately M-decomposable sets as those closed convex sets that can be approximated by M-decomposable sets in the Hausdorff distance. Our main result is a characterization of this class in terms of support functions and their demarcation from M-decomposable and hyperbolic sets. In the following section we provide preliminary definitions and notation. Section 3 contains the definition of approximately M-decomposable sets and the main results of this manuscript. In particular we show that approximately M-decomposable sets fit between M-decomposable and hyperbolic sets. They coincide with the latter given their recession cones are polyhedral. Moreover, we prove that a set is approximately M-decomposable if and only if its support function has a closed domain relative to which it is continuous.

## 2 Preliminaries

Given sets  $M, P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  and a scalar  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  we denote by  $\text{cl } M$ ,  $\text{int } M$ ,  $\text{relint } M$ ,  $M + P$  and  $\alpha M$  the *closure*, *interior*, *relative interior* of  $M$ , the *Minkowski sum* of  $M$  and  $P$  and the *dilation* of  $M$  by  $\alpha$ , respectively. The *Euclidean norm* of a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and the *Euclidean unit ball* are expressed as  $\|x\|$  and  $B$ , respectively. A set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is called *convex* if for every  $x, y \in C$  and scalar  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in C$  holds. A *cone* is a set  $C$  such that for every  $x \in C$  and  $\mu \geq 0$  it holds  $\mu x \in C$ . The *recession cone* of a convex set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is defined as the set  $\{d \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \forall x \in C, \mu \geq 0: x + \mu d \in C\}$  and denoted by  $0^+C$ . If  $C$  is closed, so is  $0^+C$ . The *polar*  $C^\circ$  of  $C$  is the set of linear functions that are bounded above on  $C$  by 1, i.e.  $C^\circ = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \forall x \in C: y^\top x \leq 1\}$ . If

$C$  is a cone, then  $C^\circ = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \forall x \in C: y^\top x \leq 0\}$ . Note that  $C^\circ$  is always closed. Given nonempty sets  $C^1, C^2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  the *Hausdorff distance*  $d_H(C^1, C^2)$  between  $C^1$  and  $C^2$  is defined as

$$d_H(C^1, C^2) = \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in C^1} \inf_{y \in C^2} \|x - y\|, \sup_{x \in C^2} \inf_{y \in C^1} \|x - y\| \right\}.$$

Note that  $d_H(C^1, C^2)$  may be infinite if any of the sets is unbounded. However, it is well known that  $d_H(\cdot, \cdot)$  defines a metric on the class of nonempty compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  [9]. Moreover, it can equivalently be expressed as

$$d_H(C^1, C^2) = \inf \left\{ \varepsilon > 0 \mid C^1 \subseteq C^2 + \varepsilon B, C^2 \subseteq C^1 + \varepsilon B \right\}, \quad (1)$$

see [8].

A function  $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is called *convex* if  $f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y)$  holds for every  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . The *domain*  $\text{dom } f$  of  $f$  is the set of points at which  $f$  is finite, i.e.  $\text{dom } f = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) < +\infty\}$ . To every  $f$  we assign a *conjugate* function  $f^*$  defined by  $f^*(y) = \sup \{y^\top x - f(x) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ . The *support function*  $\sigma_C$  of a nonempty closed convex set  $C$  is given as  $\sigma_C(d) = \sup \{d^\top x \mid x \in C\}$ . Its conjugate is called *indicator function* of  $C$  and denoted  $\delta_C$ .

### 3 Approximately M-decomposable sets

In this section we give an answer to the questions posed in the introduction. We understand a truncation of  $C$  to be the sum of a compact subset of  $C$  and  $0^+C$  in the following sense.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be nonempty closed and convex. The set  $C_r = (C \cap rB) + 0^+C$  is called a *truncation* of  $C$  of radius  $r > 0$ .

Clearly,  $C_r \subseteq C$  for all  $r > 0$ . Studying sets that are approximately truncations of themselves is motivated by the fact that, given such a set, it suffices to conduct analyses, such as minimizing some function over the set, on a compact subset to obtain good results in an approximate sense. To this end we introduce the class of approximately M(otzkin)-decomposable convex sets.

**Definition 3.2.** A nonempty closed convex set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is called *approximately M-decomposable* if, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $C \subseteq C_r + \varepsilon B$ .

By Equation (1), Definition 3.2 is equivalent to the existence of a truncation  $C_{r(\varepsilon)}$  such that the Hausdorff distance between  $C_{r(\varepsilon)}$  and  $C$  is at most  $\varepsilon$ . The designation approximately M-decomposable is derived from the stronger property of M-decomposability.

**Definition 3.3** (see [5]). A nonempty closed convex set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is called *M(otzkin)-decomposable* if there exists a compact convex set  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $C = M + 0^+C$ . Such set  $M$  is called a compact component of  $C$ .

If  $C$  is closed and convex, then every nonempty truncation  $C_r$  of  $C$  is M-decomposable with compact component  $C \cap rB$ . Moreover, if  $C$  is M-decomposable, there exist truncations of  $C$  that coincide with  $C$ . If  $M$  is any compact component of  $C$ , then  $C_r = C$  for all  $r \geq \max \{\|x\| \mid x \in M\}$ . In particular,  $C$  is approximately M-decomposable in this case. A relaxation of the condition of M-decomposability leads to hyperbolic sets.

**Definition 3.4** (cf. [1, 13]). A nonempty closed convex set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is called *hyperbolic* if there exists a compact convex set  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $C \subseteq M + 0^+C$ .

We point out that hyperbolic sets also exist under the terms  $0^+C$ -bounded [12] and self-bounded [3] sets in the literature. Moreover, it is known that  $C$  is hyperbolic if and only if  $\text{dom } \sigma_C$  is closed, see [1, Proposition 5].

Clearly, every M-decomposable set  $C$  is also hyperbolic, where the set  $M$  in Definition 3.4 may be chosen as any compact component of  $C$ , but the converse does not hold as is seen from the example  $C^1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_1 x_2 \geq 1, x_1 \geq 0\}$  and the fact  $0^+C^1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \geq 0\}$ , cf. Section 1 and Figure 1. The set  $C^1$  is the epigraph of the function  $x \mapsto x^{-1}$  restricted to the nonnegative real line. It is not difficult to see that this set is approximately M-decomposable. For  $\varepsilon > 0$  set  $r^2 \geq \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^{-2}$ . Example 3.13 below shows that not every hyperbolic set is approximately M-decomposable. However, the converse statement holds, i.e. the class of hyperbolic sets is larger in general.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be approximately M-decomposable. Then  $C$  is hyperbolic.*

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $C \subseteq C_r + \varepsilon B$ . Now,

$$C_r + \varepsilon B = (C \cap rB) + \varepsilon B + 0^+C$$

and  $(C \cap rB) + \varepsilon B$  is compact and convex. Thus,  $C$  is hyperbolic.  $\square$

In order to characterize approximately M-decomposable sets we need another expression for the Hausdorff distance between certain closed convex sets. The following is a generalization of a well-known result for compact convex sets, see e.g. [8, Proposition 6.3].

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $C^1, C^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be nonempty closed convex sets whose support functions have identical domains  $D$ , i.e.  $D = \text{dom } \sigma_{C^1} = \text{dom } \sigma_{C^2}$ . Then*

$$d_H(C^1, C^2) = \sup_{d \in D \cap B} |\sigma_{C^1}(d) - \sigma_{C^2}(d)|.$$

Furthermore,  $d_H(C^1, C^2) = +\infty$  whenever  $\text{dom } \sigma_{C^1} \neq \text{dom } \sigma_{C^2}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $C^1$  and  $C^2$  are nonempty,  $D$  is also nonempty because  $\sigma_{C^1}(0) = \sigma_{C^2}(0) = 0$ , i.e.  $0 \in D$ . Denote by  $d(x, C^1)$  the Euclidean distance from  $x$  to  $C^1$ , i.e.  $d(x, C^1) = \inf_{y \in C^1} \|x - y\|$ . Then  $d_H(C^1, C^2)$  can be written as  $\max \{ \sup_{x \in C^1} d(x, C^2), \sup_{x \in C^2} d(x, C^1) \}$ . Moreover, it holds  $d(x, C^1) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\|x - y\| + \delta_{C^1}(y))$ . According to [15, Theorem 16.4] the conjugate of  $d(\cdot, C^1)$  is thus given as  $d^*(\cdot, C^1) = \delta_B + \sigma_{C^1}$ . Since  $d(\cdot, C^1)$  is closed proper and convex it holds

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, C^1) &= d^{**}(x, C^1) \\ &= \sup_{d \in \mathbb{R}^n} (x^\top d - \delta_B(d) - \sigma_{C^1}(d)) \\ &= \sup_{d \in D \cap B} (x^\top d - \sigma_{C^1}(d)). \end{aligned}$$

The first equation is due to [15, Theorem 12.2] and the third holds because  $\text{dom } \sigma_{C^1} = D$ . Analogously one has  $d(x, C^2) = \sup_{d \in D \cap B} (x^\top d - \sigma_{C^2}(d))$ . Combining both expressions yields

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(C^1, C^2) &= \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in C^2} \sup_{d \in D \cap B} (x^\top d - \sigma_{C^1}(d)), \sup_{x \in C^1} \sup_{d \in D \cap B} (x^\top d - \sigma_{C^2}(d)) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{d \in D \cap B} \max \{ \sigma_{C^2}(d) - \sigma_{C^1}(d), \sigma_{C^1}(d) - \sigma_{C^2}(d) \} \\ &= \sup_{d \in D \cap B} |\sigma_{C^1}(d) - \sigma_{C^2}(d)|. \end{aligned}$$

For the second part assume, without loss of generality,  $d \in \text{dom } \sigma_{C^1} \setminus \text{dom } \sigma_{C^2}$ ,  $\|d\| = 1$ . Then for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $y_k \in C^2$ , such that  $d^\top y_k > k$ . Denote by  $H$  the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid d^\top x \leq \sigma_{C^1}(d)\}$ . Since  $C^1 \subseteq H$ , it holds  $d(y_k, C^1) \geq d(y_k, H) = d^\top y_k - \sigma_{C^1}(d) > k - \sigma_{C^1}(d)$  for all  $k \geq \sigma_{C^1}(d)$ . Taking the limit  $k \rightarrow +\infty$  yields the result.  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** Note that, even if  $\text{dom } \sigma_{C^1} = \text{dom } \sigma_{C^2}$ , it is possible, that  $d_H(C^1, C^2) = +\infty$ . Consider, for example, the sets  $C^1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 \geq x_1^2\}$  and  $C^2 = 2C^1$ . The domain of their support functions is the non-closed set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 < 0\} \cup \{0\}$ . For  $d_k = (1, -1/k)^\top$  one has  $\sigma_{C^1}(d_k) = k/2$  and  $\sigma_{C^2}(d_k) = k$ , i.e.

$$\sigma_{C^2} \left( \frac{d_k}{\|d_k\|} \right) - \sigma_{C^1} \left( \frac{d_k}{\|d_k\|} \right) = \frac{k^2}{2\sqrt{k^2 + 1}}$$

which is unbounded in  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We have already seen that not every closed convex set  $C$  is approximately  $M$ -decomposable, i.e. can be approximated by truncations in the Hausdorff distance. However, truncations always approximate  $C$  in a weaker sense.

**Definition 3.8** (cf. [16]). A sequence of  $\{C^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  of closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is said to *converge in the sense of Painlevé-Kuratowski* or *PK-converge* to a closed set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  if

$$C = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x, C^k) = 0 \right\}.$$

For bounded sequences PK-convergence and convergence with respect to the Hausdorff distance coincide, but the concepts are distinct in general, see [16].

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be nonempty closed convex. Then  $\{C_r\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$  PK-converges to  $C$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in C$ . Then  $x \in C_r$  for all  $r \geq \|x\|$ . Hence,  $\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} d(x, C_r)$  exists and is zero. On the contrary, let  $x \notin C$ . Since  $C$  is closed,  $d(x, C) > 0$ . Moreover,  $d(x, C_r) \geq d(x, C)$  holds for all  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  because  $C_r \subseteq C$ . Thus  $x \notin \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} d(x, C^k) = 0\}$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main result of this work.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be a nonempty closed convex set. The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $C$  is approximately  $M$ -decomposable,
- (ii)  $\text{dom } \sigma_C$  is closed and  $\sigma_C$  is continuous relative to  $\text{dom } \sigma_C$ .

Moreover, the set  $\text{dom } \sigma_C$  in (ii) equals  $(0^+C)^\circ$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $C$  is approximately M-decomposable, i.e.

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists r \geq 0: C_r \subseteq C \subseteq C_r + \varepsilon B. \quad (2)$$

For the remainder of the proof assume  $\varepsilon$  and  $r$  are fixed such that the inclusions in (2) hold. In particular,  $C_r + \varepsilon B$  and, consequently,  $C_r$  are nonempty. It follows

$$\sigma_{C_r} \leq \sigma_C \leq \sigma_{C_r + \varepsilon B} \quad (3)$$

for the support functions of  $C_r$ ,  $C$  and  $C_r + \varepsilon B$ , see [15, Corollary 13.1.1]. Since all three sets have the same recession cone  $0^+C$ , it follows from [15, Corollary 14.2.1] that

$$\text{cl dom } \sigma_{C_r} = \text{cl dom } \sigma_C = \text{cl dom } \sigma_{C_r + \varepsilon B} = (0^+C)^\circ.$$

However, for  $d \in (0^+C)^\circ$  one has

$$\sigma_{C_r + \varepsilon B}(d) = \sigma_{(C \cap rB) + \varepsilon B}(d) < +\infty.$$

Thus  $\text{dom } \sigma_{C_r} = \text{dom } \sigma_C = \text{dom } \sigma_{C_r + \varepsilon B} = (0^+C)^\circ$  due to Inequality (3).

The support functions  $\sigma_{C_r}$  and  $\sigma_{C \cap rB}$  coincide on  $(0^+C)^\circ$ . Since  $C \cap rB$  is compact, its support function is finite everywhere and therefore continuous according to [15, Corollary 10.1.1]. Thus,  $\sigma_{C_r}$  is continuous relative to its domain  $(0^+C)^\circ$ . Using the expression for the Hausdorff distance from Equation (1), (2) is equivalent to

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists r \geq 0: d_H(C_r, C) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4)$$

Since

$$r \leq \bar{r} \implies C_r \subseteq C_{\bar{r}} \subseteq C, \quad (5)$$

Statement (4) is equivalent to  $\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} d_H(C_r, C) = 0$ . Applying Proposition 3.6 gives

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{d \in (0^+C)^\circ \cap B} |\sigma_C(d) - \sigma_{C_r}(d)| = 0. \quad (6)$$

Thus,  $\sigma_{C_r}$  converges uniformly to  $\sigma_C$  on  $(0^+C)^\circ$ . As  $\sigma_{C_r}$  is continuous on its domain, the Uniform Limit Theorem [14, Theorem 21.6] yields that  $\sigma_C$  is continuous on its domain as well.

Now, assume  $\text{dom } \sigma_C$  is closed and  $\sigma_C: \text{dom } \sigma_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous. Again,  $\text{dom } \sigma_C = (0^+C)^\circ$  by [15, Corollary 14.2.1]. We show that  $\sigma_{C_r}$  converges pointwise to  $\sigma_C$  on  $(0^+C)^\circ$  as  $r \rightarrow +\infty$ . Property (5) implies that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sigma_{C_r}(d)$  exists for all  $d \in (0^+C)^\circ$  and is finite. In particular it holds



$\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sigma_{C_r}(d) \leq \sigma_C(d)$ . Assume  $\sigma_{C_r}$  does not converge pointwise to  $\sigma_C$  on  $(0^+C)^\circ$ , i.e. there exists  $\bar{d} \in (0^+C)^\circ$  for which the inequality holds strictly. This implies  $\bar{d} \neq 0$ . Let  $\gamma = \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sigma_{C_r}(\bar{d})$ . Then  $C_r \subseteq H := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \bar{d}^\top x \leq \gamma\}$  for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and there exists  $\bar{x} \in C$  such that  $\bar{d}^\top \bar{x} > \gamma$ . It holds

$$d(\bar{x}, C_r) \geq d(\bar{x}, H) = \frac{\bar{d}^\top \bar{x} - \gamma}{\|\bar{d}\|} > 0.$$

This is a contradiction because  $\{C_r\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$  PK-converges to  $C$  by Lemma 3.9, i.e.  $C = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} d(x, C_r) = 0\}$ . Thus  $\sigma_{C_r}$  converges pointwise to  $\sigma_C$  on  $(0^+C)^\circ$ .

Since  $\sigma_C$  is continuous and  $\sigma_{C_r}$  is monotonically non-decreasing in  $r$ , Dini's theorem [10, Theorem 12.1] yields that the convergence is uniform on  $(0^+C)^\circ \cap B$ , i.e. Equation (6) holds. Finally, using the equivalence between (6), (4) and (2) proves that  $C$  is approximately M-decomposable.  $\square$

**Remark 3.11.** In the above proof we have shown the pointwise convergence of the support functions of truncations  $C_r$  to the support function of  $C$  on  $(0^+C)^\circ$  using the PK-convergence of  $\{C_r\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We point out that this may also be achieved using the different concept of  $\mathcal{C}$ -convergence introduced in [11]. To this end one needs to take into account that  $\sigma_C = \sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_{C_r}$  and apply [11, Theorem 5.9] and [11, Proposition 5.3 (iv)].

**Remark 3.12.** In [4] *continuous convex sets* are introduced, which are similar to, but different from, approximate M-decomposable sets. A convex set is called continuous if its support function is continuous everywhere (and not necessarily only relative to its domain). For example, the set  $C^1$  from Section 1 is approximately M-decomposable, but not continuous, whereas  $C^2$  is continuous, but the domain of its support function is not closed. Thus it is not approximately M-decomposable, see [4, p. 1]. Clearly, every compact convex set is both continuous and (approximately) M-decomposable.

Using Theorem 3.10 we can show that hyperbolicity does not imply approximate M-decomposability.

**Example 3.13.** Let  $C^2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 \geq x_1^2\}$ , cf. Section 1 and Figure 1, and consider the following set

$$C = (C^2 \times \{0\}) + \text{cl cone}(C^2 \times \{1\})$$

in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . By [15, Theorem 8.2] it holds

$$\text{cl cone}(C^2 \times \{1\}) = \text{cone}(C^2 \times \{1\}) \cup (0^+C^2 \times \{0\}).$$

Now, according to [15, Corollary 9.1.2]  $C$  is closed and one has  $0^+C = \text{cl cone}(C^2 \times \{1\})$ . To see that  $C$  is hyperbolic, choose any  $x \in C$ . Then  $x = c + s$  for some  $c \in C^2 \times \{0\}$  and  $s \in 0^+C$ . For  $d = (0, 0, -1)^\top$  it holds  $x = d + (c - d) + s$ . Since  $c - d \in 0^+C$ ,  $c - d + s \in 0^+C$  as well. Hence,  $C \subseteq \{d\} + 0^+C$ .

According to [2, Theorem 3.1] one has

$$(0^+C)^\circ = \text{cl cone}(C^{2^\circ} \times \{-1\})$$

and a simple calculation shows that  $C^{2^\circ} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 \leq -x_1^2/4\}$ . Therefore,

$$d_n = \begin{pmatrix} n^{-1} \\ -(2n)^{-2} \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \in (0^+C)^\circ$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d_n = d$ . Now,

$$\sigma_C(d_n) \geq d_n^\top \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{3}{4} > 0.$$

However,  $\sigma_C(d) \leq 0$  because for  $x \in C$  it holds  $x_3 \geq 0$ . Hence,  $\sigma_C$  is not continuous at  $d \in (0^+C)^\circ$  and by Theorem 3.10 not approximately M-decomposable.

If an additional assumption is made, hyperbolicity and approximate M-decomposability are equivalent.

**Corollary 3.14.** *Let  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be nonempty closed convex and  $0^+C$  be polyhedral. Then  $C$  is approximately M-decomposable if and only if it is hyperbolic.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.5, the first implication is true regardless of the polyhedrality of  $0^+C$ .

Assume that  $C$  is hyperbolic, i.e.  $C \subseteq M + 0^+C$  for some compact convex set  $M$ . This implies  $\text{dom } \sigma_C \subseteq (0^+C)^\circ$  and thus actually  $\text{dom } \sigma_C = (0^+C)^\circ$  by [15, Corollary 14.2.1]. Since  $0^+C$  is polyhedral, so is  $(0^+C)^\circ$ . Hence it is locally simplicial, see [15, Theorem 20.5], and [15, Theorem 10.2] implies that  $\sigma_C$  is continuous relative to its domain. Now, apply Theorem 3.10.  $\square$

The corollary implies that, whenever  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ , it is approximately M-decomposable if and only if it is hyperbolic because every closed convex cone in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is polyhedral. Thus, the set from Example 3.13 is in the lowest possible dimension to demonstrate that hyperbolicity is, in general, not equivalent to approximate M-decomposability.

## 4 Conclusion

In this article we have introduced the class of approximately M-decomposable sets as those closed convex sets that can be approximated arbitrarily well by truncations with respect to the Hausdorff distance. We have shown that they generalize the class of M-decomposable sets and are a special case of hyperbolic sets but coincide with neither in general as demonstrated by examples. Furthermore, we characterized the approximately M-decomposable sets in terms of their support functions. Finally we proved that, when considering only polyhedral recession cones, approximate M-decomposability and hyperbolicity are equivalent.

**Acknowledgements** The authors thank Juan Enrique Martínez-Legaz for useful comments on the contents of the article, in particular, for pointing them to [1] and the notion of hyperbolic convex set.

## References

- [1] J. Bair. “Liens entre le cône d’ouverture interne et l’intérieur du cône asymptotique d’un convexe”. In: *Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. Sér. B* 35.2 (1983), pp. 177–187.
- [2] H. H. Bauschke, T. Bendit, and H. Wang. “The homogenization cone: polar cone and projection”. In: *Set-Valued Var. Anal.* 31.3 (2023), Paper No. 29, 24.
- [3] D. Dörfler. “On the approximation of unbounded convex sets by polyhedra”. In: *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 194.1 (2022), pp. 265–287.
- [4] D. Gale and V. Klee. “Continuous convex sets”. In: *Math. Scand.* 7 (1959), pp. 379–391.
- [5] M. A. Goberna, E. González, J. E. Martínez-Legaz, and M. I. Todorov. “Motzkin decomposition of closed convex sets”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 364.1 (2010), pp. 209–221.
- [6] M. A. Goberna, A. Iusem, J. E. Martínez-Legaz, and M. I. Todorov. “Motzkin decomposition of closed convex sets via truncation”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 400.1 (2013), pp. 35–47.
- [7] M. A. Goberna, J. E. Martínez-Legaz, and M. I. Todorov. “On Motzkin decomposable sets and functions”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 372.2 (2010), pp. 525–537.

- [8] P. M. Gruber. *Convex and Discrete Geometry*. Vol. 336. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer, Berlin, 2007, pp. xiv+578.
- [9] F. Hausdorff. *Grundzüge der Mengenlehre*. Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1949, pp. viii+476.
- [10] J. Jost. *Postmodern analysis*. Third. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005, pp. xvi+371.
- [11] A. Löhne and C. Zălinescu. “On convergence of closed convex sets”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 319.2 (2006), pp. 617–634.
- [12] D. T. Lưc. *Theory of vector optimization*. Vol. 319. Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989, pp. viii+173.
- [13] J.-E. Martínez-Legaz and S. Romano-Rodríguez. “Lower subdifferentiability of quadratic functions”. In: *Math. Programming* 60.1 (1993), pp. 93–113.
- [14] J. R. Munkres. *Topology*. Second. Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2000, pp. xvi+537. ISBN: 0-13-181629-2.
- [15] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Vol. No. 28. Princeton Mathematical Series. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970, pp. xviii+451.
- [16] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets. *Variational analysis*. Vol. 317. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998, pp. xiv+733.
- [17] V. Soltan. “On M-decomposable sets”. In: *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 485.2 (2020), pp. 123816, 15.