

# ON THE INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION AND THE RAŞA, JENSEN AND HERMITE-HADAMARD INEQUALITIES FOR BOX- $(n_1, \dots, n_d)$ -CONVEX FUNCTIONS

ANDRZEJ KOMISARSKI AND TERESA RAJBA

ABSTRACT. We give the integral representation of box- $(n_1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex functions, which are a generalization of Popoviciu's [14]  $n$ -convex and box- $(m, n)$ -convex functions. Based on this integral representation, we obtain the Raşa, Jensen and Hermite-Hadamard inequalities for these functions. We extend the results obtained in [4, 6, 7, 12, 14]

## 1. INTRODUCTION

H. Hopf [8] and T. Popoviciu [14, 15] introduced the notion of higher order convex functions based on the so called divided differences. Let  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $I$  be a subinterval of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Given a function  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of one real variable and a system  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}$  of pairwise distinct points of  $I$  the *divided differences* of order  $0, 1, \dots, n+1$  are respectively defined by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} [x_0; f] &= f(x_0), \\ [x_0, x_1; f] &= \frac{f(x_1) - f(x_0)}{x_1 - x_0}, \quad \dots, \\ [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}; f] &= \frac{[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}; f] - [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; f]}{x_{n+1} - x_0}. \end{aligned}$$

The function  $f(x)$  is called *n-convex* (resp. *n-concave*, *n-affine*), if  $[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}; f] \geq 0$  (resp.  $\leq 0$ ,  $= 0$ ) for any pairwise distinct points  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}$ . The function  $f$  is convex when all divided differences of order two are nonnegative for all systems of pairwise distinct points. If  $f^{(n+1)}$  exists, then  $f$  is *n-convex* (*n-concave*) if, and only if,  $f^{(n+1)} \geq 0$  ( $f^{(n+1)} \leq 0$ ).

**Proposition 1** ([14]). *A function  $f(x)$  is n-convex if and only if its derivative  $f^{(n-1)}(x)$  exists and is convex (with the convention  $f^{(0)}(x) = f(x)$ ).*

If  $f = f(x, y)$  is a function defined on a rectangle  $I \times J$  and  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m$  are pairwise distinct points of  $I$  and  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n$  are pairwise distinct points of  $J$ , one defines the *divided double difference* of order  $(m, n)$  by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_0, & x_1, & \dots & x_m \\ y_0, & y_1, & \dots & y_n \end{bmatrix}; f &= [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m; [y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n; f(x, \cdot)]] \\ (2) &= [y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n; [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m; f(\cdot, y)]] \end{aligned}$$

Drawing a parallel to the one dimensional case, T. Popoviciu [14], p.78, has called a function  $f: I \times J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  *convex of order  $(m, n)$*  (*box- $(m, n)$ -convex* in our terminology) if all divided differences

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_0, & x_1, & \dots & x_m \\ y_0, & y_1, & \dots & y_n \end{bmatrix}; f$$

are nonnegative for all pairwise distinct points  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m$  and  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n$ . The related notions of *box- $(m, n)$ -concave* function and *box- $(m, n)$ -affine* function can be introduced in the standard way.

In [12], we obtained the integral representation, the Raşa, Jensen and Hermite-Hadamard inequalities for box- $(m, n)$ -convex functions.

Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d)$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $n_1, \dots, n_d \in \mathbb{N}$ . In this paper, we define and study box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions of  $d$  real variables, such that in the case  $d = 2$ ,  $n_1 = m$ ,  $n_2 = n$ , the class of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions coincides with the class of box- $(m, n)$ -convex functions. We give the integral representation and several characterizations of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions. Using the integral representation, we obtain the Raşa, Jensen and Hermite-Hadamard inequalities for box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions.

The results known in the literature regarding box-convex functions used differential methods to study these functions. They required assumptions about high regularity (the existence of derivatives of high orders). In this article, we do not make any assumptions about regularity of the studied functions (they may even be non-measurable). However, we still use differential methods. This is possible thanks to the notion of  $\mathbf{n}$ -regularity introduced in Section 5 and the regularization of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions, based on Proposition 6. We first used this idea in [12] for functions of two variables. However, the general case (with  $d > 2$ ) is much more complicated and introduces some phenomena that do not occur for  $d = 2$ .

In Section 2, we recall the selected properties of divided differences of order  $n$  given in [12].

In Section 3, we give the definitions and selected properties of multiple divided differences of order  $n$ .

In Section 4, we prove that the set of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine functions coincides with the set of pseudopolynomials of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ .

In Section 5, we introduce the notion of  $\mathbf{n}$ -regularity of functions and we give properties of  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular functions.

In Section 6, we study properties of integration and differentiation of  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular functions.

In Section 7, we obtain the integral representation of box-monotone function, i.e. box- $(1, \dots, 1)$ -convex functions.

In Section 8, we obtain the integral representation of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex function.

In Section 9, we give properties of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex orders.

In Section 10, we obtain the Hermite-Hadamard, Jensen and Raşa inequalities for box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions.

Throughout this article, we assume that  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  unless otherwise stated.

## 2. SELECTED PROPERTIES OF DIVIDED DIFFERENCES OF ORDER $n$

The following expanded form of divided difference is well known.

### Proposition 2.

$$[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; f] = \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{f(x_j)}{\prod_{\substack{l=0 \\ l \neq j}}^n (x_j - x_l)}. \quad (3)$$

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $n \geq 1$ , let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval,  $\alpha \in I$  and let  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an integrable function. For pairwise distinct points  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n \in I$ , we have*

$$\left[ x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; \int_{\alpha}^{\cdot} f(t) dt \right] = \int_0^1 t^{n-1} [x_{1,t}, \dots, x_{n,t}; f] dt,$$

where  $x_{i,t} = tx_i + (1-t)x_0$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

*Proof.* The proof of the lemma is by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$  we have

$$\left[ x_0, x_1; \int_{\alpha}^{\cdot} f(t) dt \right] = \frac{\int_{x_0}^{x_1} f(t) dt}{x_1 - x_0} = \int_0^1 f(x_{1,t}) dt = \int_0^1 t^{1-1} [x_{1,t}; f] dt.$$

In the induction step, we use the definition of the divided difference and the fact that it does not depend on the permutation of the points  $x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[ x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}; \int_{\alpha} f(t) dt \right] &= \left[ x_1, x_0, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}; \int_{\alpha} f(t) dt \right] \\
&= \frac{\left[ x_0, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1}; \int_{\alpha} f(t) dt \right] - \left[ x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; \int_{\alpha} f(t) dt \right]}{x_{n+1} - x_1} \\
&= \int_0^1 t^{n-1} \frac{[x_{2,t}, \dots, x_{n+1,t}; f] - [x_{1,t}, \dots, x_{n,t}; f]}{x_{n+1} - x_1} dt \\
&= \int_0^1 t^n \frac{[x_{2,t}, \dots, x_{n+1,t}; f] - [x_{1,t}, \dots, x_{n,t}; f]}{x_{n+1,t} - x_{1,t}} dt \\
&= \int_0^1 t^{(n+1)-1} [x_{1,t}, \dots, x_{n+1,t}; f] dt.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $n \geq 2$ , let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval, and let  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a right-differentiable function. Let  $f'_R: I \setminus \{\sup I\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a right-derivative of  $f$ . For pairwise distinct points  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in I \setminus \{\sup I\}$  and  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , the limit  $\lim_{x_0 \downarrow x_k} [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; f]$  exists and*

$$\lim_{x_0 \downarrow x_k} [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; f] = \frac{f'_R(x_k)}{\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq k}}^n (x_k - x_i)} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^n \frac{1}{x_j - x_k} \left( \frac{f(x_j)}{\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^n (x_j - x_i)} + \frac{f(x_k)}{\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq k}}^n (x_k - x_i)} \right). \quad (4)$$

Moreover,

$$[x_1, \dots, x_n; f'_R] = \sum_{k=1}^n \lim_{x_0 \downarrow x_k} [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; f].$$

*Proof.* Due to symmetry, it is enough to show that (4) holds for  $k = 1$ . We skip an easy proof by induction on  $n$ . Using (4), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \lim_{x_0 \downarrow x_k} [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n; f] = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{f'_R(x_k)}{\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq k}}^n (x_k - x_i)} = [x_1, \dots, x_n; f'_R].$$

□

### 3. DIVIDED DIFFERENCES OF ORDER $(n_1, \dots, n_d)$ AND BOX- $(n_1, \dots, n_d)$ -CONVEX FUNCTIONS

Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . For every  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  let  $A' = \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \setminus A$  be the complement of the set  $A$ .

For  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  let  $\mathbf{x}_A = (x_{a_1}, x_{a_2}, \dots, x_{a_{|A|}})$ , and  $\mathbf{n}_A = (n_{a_1}, n_{a_2}, \dots, n_{a_{|A|}})$ , where  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|})$  is the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A$  (i.e.,  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$  and  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}$ ). In particular  $\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}} = (x_i)$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}$  =  $(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d)$ .

Let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_d \subset \mathbb{R}$  be intervals (bounded or unbounded). We denote  $\mathbf{I} = \prod_{i=1}^d I_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . If  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ , then we put  $\mathbf{I}_A = \prod_{i \in A} I_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{|A|}$ . Clearly, if  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{I}$ , then  $\mathbf{x}_A \in \mathbf{I}_A$ .

For  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_{A'}$  we denote by  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}} = f_A: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the function given by

$$f_A^{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{y}) = f(\mathbf{x}),$$

where

$$x_i = \begin{cases} y_j & \text{if } i \in A \text{ and } a_j = i, \\ z_j & \text{if } i \in A' \text{ and } a'_j = i, \end{cases}$$

$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|})$  is the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A$ , and  $(a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_{|A'|})$  is the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A'$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}$  is the unique element of  $\mathbf{I}$  satisfying  $\mathbf{x}_A = \mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{A'} = \mathbf{z}$ ). In particular,  $f_A^{\mathbf{x}_{A'}}(\mathbf{x}_A) = f(\mathbf{x})$ . The idea behind the notation  $f_A(\cdot)$  is to reduce the number of variables of  $f$  by treating some of them as parameters (those that are standing at the positions described by the set  $A'$ ).

It is convenient to consider the special case  $d = 0$ . Then  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a constant (a function of 0 variables).

**Definition 1.** Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . For  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  let  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i}) \in I_i^{n_i+1}$  be a vector with pairwise distinct coordinates. We inductively define the multiple divided difference of order  $\mathbf{n}$  as follows.

If  $d = 0$  (i.e.  $f$  is a constant), then  $[\cdot; f] = f$ .

If  $d = 1$ , then  $[\mathbf{x}_1; f] = [x_{10}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n_1}; f]$  is the divided difference defined in the Introduction (Section 1).

If  $d > 1$ , then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2; f \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{10}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n_1} \\ x_{20}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{2n_2}; f \\ \dots \\ x_{d0}, x_{d1}, \dots, x_{dn_d} \end{bmatrix} = [x_{d0}, x_{d1}, \dots, x_{dn_d}; g],$$

where  $g: I_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$g(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_{10}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n_1} \\ x_{20}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{2n_2} \\ \dots \\ x_{d-1,0}, x_{d-1,1}, \dots, x_{d-1,n_{d-1}} \end{bmatrix}; f_{\{1,2,\dots,d-1\}}^x.$$

In other words, we apply the divided differences to successive arguments of  $f$ .

In the following proposition, we give the expanded form of divided difference of order  $\mathbf{n}$ , which is a generalization of (3).

**Proposition 3.** If  $d > 0$ , then

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{10}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n_1} \\ x_{20}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{2n_2}; f \\ \dots \\ x_{d0}, x_{d1}, \dots, x_{dn_d} \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{j_1=0}^{n_1} \sum_{j_2=0}^{n_2} \dots \sum_{j_d=0}^{n_d} \frac{f(x_{1j_1}, x_{2j_2}, \dots, x_{dj_d})}{\prod_{i=1}^d \prod_{\substack{l_i=0 \\ l_i \neq j_i}}^{n_i} (x_{ij_i} - x_{il_i})}. \quad (5)$$

*Sketch of the proof.* By induction on  $m = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and taking into account Proposition 2, we obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{10}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n_1} \\ x_{20}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{2n_2} \\ \dots \\ x_{m0}, x_{m1}, \dots, x_{mn_m} \end{bmatrix}; g = \sum_{j_1=0}^{n_1} \sum_{j_2=0}^{n_2} \dots \sum_{j_m=0}^{n_m} \frac{g(x_{1j_1}, x_{2j_2}, \dots, x_{mj_m})}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{\substack{l_i=0 \\ l_i \neq j_i}}^{n_i} (x_{ij_i} - x_{il_i})},$$

for every function  $g: \mathbf{I}_{\{1,2,\dots,m\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $g = f_{\{1,2,\dots,m\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  for some  $\mathbf{y} \in I_{\{m+1,\dots,d\}}$ . For  $m = d$  we obtain (5).  $\square$

By symmetry of formula (5), we see that the order in which the divided differences are applied in Definition 1 is not important (similarly, as in the two-dimensional case, cf. [4, 12, 14]). In particular, the following observation holds.

**Remark 3.** If  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ ,  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$ ,  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}$ , and  $A' = \{a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_{|A'|}\}$ ,  $a'_1 < a'_2 < \dots < a'_{|A'|}$ , then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; f = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{a'_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{a'_2} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{a'_{|A'|}} \end{bmatrix}; g,$$

where  $g: \mathbf{I}_{A'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{a_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_2} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_{|A|}} \end{bmatrix}; f_A^{\mathbf{x}}.$$

An immediate consequence of Remark 3 is the following observation.

**Remark 4.** Let  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ ,  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$ ,  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}$ , and  $A' = \{a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_{|A'|}\}$ ,  $a'_1 < a'_2 < \dots < a'_{|A'|}$ . Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function given by the formula  $f(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}_A) \cdot h(\mathbf{x}_{A'})$ , where  $g: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $h: \mathbf{I}_{A'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; f = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{a_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_2} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_{|A|}} \end{bmatrix}; g \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{a'_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{a'_2} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{a'_{|A'|}} \end{bmatrix}; h.$$

**Definition 2.** Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . We say that the function  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex** if

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; f \geq 0 \tag{6}$$

for every  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i}) \in I_i^{n_i+1}$  is a vector with pairwise distinct coordinates ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ ).

We say that  $f$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -concave** if it satisfies (6) with  $\geq$  replaced by  $\leq$ .

We say that  $f$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine** if (6) becomes the equality.

**Remark 5.** Observe that for every  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  the sets of all **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex** functions and all **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -concave** functions are convex cones in the space of all real functions on  $\mathbf{I}$ . The set of all **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine** functions is a linear subspace of that space.

**Remark 6.** The case  $d = 2$  was investigated in [12].

If  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function of one variable ( $d = 1$ ), then  $f$  is **box- $(n)$ -convex** if and only if it is  $(n - 1)$ -convex in the classical sense. In particular, **box- $(0)$ -convexity** of a function  $f$  means that  $f$  is non-negative. **Box- $(1)$ -convexity** of  $f$  means that  $f$  is non-decreasing. **Box- $(2)$ -convexity** of a function is equivalent to its convexity. If  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is **box- $(2)$ -convex** and  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is open, then  $f$  is continuous and right-differentiable. For  $n > 2$  and open  $I$  every **box- $(n)$ -convex** function has a derivative of order  $n - 2$ , which is a convex function.

By Remark 4 we obtain the following remark.

**Remark 7.** Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ . Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function given by the formula  $f(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}_A) \cdot h(\mathbf{x}_{A'})$ , where  $g: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $h: \mathbf{I}_{A'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then

- if  $g$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex** and  $h$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}_{A'}$ -convex**, then  $f$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex**.
- if  $g$  is a linear combination of **box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex** functions and  $h$  is a linear combination of **box- $\mathbf{n}_{A'}$ -convex** functions, then  $f$  is a linear combination of **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex** functions.
- if  $g$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -affine** or  $h$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}_{A'}$ -affine**, then  $f$  is **box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine**.

4. PSEUDO-POLYNOMIALS AND BOX- $\mathbf{n}$ -AFFINE FUNCTIONS

**Definition 3.** Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \{-1, 0, \dots\}^d$ . We say that the function  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $\mathbf{n}$  if it is of the form

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k,$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ , and  $A_{ik}: \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i$ ) are arbitrary functions (as usually,  $\sum_{k=0}^{-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k = 0$  if  $n_i = -1$ ).

**Example 1.** Let  $d = 3$  and  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, n_3) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ . Then, the function  $W: I_1 \times I_2 \times I_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $\mathbf{n}$  if it is of the form

$$W(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_1} A_{1k}(x_2, x_3) x_1^k + \sum_{k=0}^{n_2} A_{2k}(x_1, x_3) x_2^k + \sum_{k=0}^{n_3} A_{3k}(x_1, x_2) x_3^k,$$

where  $A_{1k}: I_2 \times I_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_1$ ),  $A_{2k}: I_1 \times I_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_2$ ) and  $A_{3k}: I_1 \times I_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_3$ ) are arbitrary functions.

**Remark 8.** Note that, in general, the degree of a pseudo-polynomial is not uniquely determined. For example  $W(x, y) = e^x y + e^y x + x^2 y^2$  is a pseudo-polynomial of both degrees  $(1, 2)$  and  $(2, 1)$ , but it is not a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(1, 1)$ .

**Lemma 9.** Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We fix  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ . Let  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}$  be pairwise distinct elements of  $I_i$ . There exists a pseudo-polynomial  $W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$  such that

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d),$$

whenever  $x_i \in \{u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}\}$ .

Moreover, for each  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i - 1$ , the function  $A_{ik}$  is a linear combination of the functions  $f_{\{i\}'}^{u_{i1}}$ ,  $f_{\{i\}'}^{u_{i2}}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $f_{\{i\}'}^{u_{in_i}}$ , where

$$f_{\{i\}'}^{u_{ij}}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d)$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ .

*Proof.* We fix  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ . For every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'}$ , let  $A_{ik}(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i - 1$ ) be such that  $L(x) = L_{\mathbf{y}}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{y}) x^k$  is the Lagrange interpolation polynomial of the function  $f_{\{i\}'}^{\mathbf{y}}$  for  $n_i$  nodes  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}$ . Then  $L_{\mathbf{y}}(x) = f(y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, x, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_d)$  for  $x \in \{u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}\}$ , and the coefficients  $A_{ik}(\mathbf{y})$  are linear combinations of the values  $f_{\{i\}'}^{\mathbf{y}}(u_{i1}) = f_{\{i\}'}^{u_{i1}}(\mathbf{y})$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $f_{\{i\}'}^{\mathbf{y}}(u_{in_i}) = f_{\{i\}'}^{u_{in_i}}(\mathbf{y})$ . We put

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = L_{\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}}(x_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k.$$

The lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 10.** Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , let  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}$  be pairwise distinct elements of  $I_i$ . There exists a pseudo-polynomial  $W$  of degree  $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ , such that

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) \quad (7)$$

for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ .

*Proof.* We will define functions  $g_i: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and pseudo-polynomials  $W_i: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ ) by induction. First we put  $g_i = f - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} W_j$ . Next, the pseudo-polynomial

$$W_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$$

such that  $g_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = W_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ , whenever  $x_i \in \{u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}\}$ , is obtained using Lemma 9.

Taking the pseudo-polynomial  $W = \sum_{i=1}^d W_i$ , we obtain that equation (7) is satisfied. The lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . If  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ , then  $W$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine.*

*Proof.* Let  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$  of the form

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k,$$

where  $A_{ik}: \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i - 1$ ) are arbitrary functions.

For a fixed  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i - 1$  we have that  $I_i \ni x_i \mapsto x_i^k$  is a box- $(n_i)$ -affine function and  $A_{ik}: \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . By Remark 7(c) we obtain that  $\mathbf{I} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine. Consequently,  $W(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and  $f, g: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be two box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine functions. Let  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}$  be pairwise distinct elements of  $I_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ ). If*

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) = g(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) \quad (8)$$

for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ , then  $f = g$ .

*Proof.* Let  $h = f - g$ . For  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  let  $x_{i0} = x_i$  and  $x_{ij} = u_{ij}$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ ). Since  $h$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine, by Proposition 3 we obtain

$$\sum_{j_1=0}^{n_1} \sum_{j_2=0}^{n_2} \dots \sum_{j_d=0}^{n_d} \frac{h(x_{1j_1}, x_{2j_2}, \dots, x_{dj_d})}{\prod_{i=1}^d \prod_{\substack{l_i=0 \\ l_i \neq j_i}}^{n_i} (x_{ij_i} - x_{il_i})} = 0.$$

Equality (8) implies that  $h(x_{1j_1}, x_{2j_2}, \dots, x_{dj_d}) = 0$ , whenever at least one of  $j_i$ 's is non-zero. Consequently,  $h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = h(x_{10}, x_{20}, \dots, x_{d0}) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 12.** *Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . Then a function  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine, if and only if it is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ .*

*Proof.* For the implication  $(\Leftarrow)$  see Lemma 11. We need to show the implication  $(\Rightarrow)$ .

For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , we fix arbitrary  $n_i$  pairwise distinct points  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i} \in I_i$ . Let  $W$  be the pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$  obtained by Lemma 10, for which (7) is satisfied. By Lemma 11, we have that  $W$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine. Then, by Proposition 4 it follows that  $f = W$ . The theorem is proved.  $\square$

## 5. $\mathbf{n}$ -REGULAR FUNCTIONS

The box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions may be very irregular (they may even be non-measurable, e.g.  $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = h(x_1)$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex for each  $d \geq 2$ ,  $\mathbf{n} \in \{1, 2, \dots\}^d$  and any function  $h$  of one variable). However, we will use differential methods to study them. This is possible thanks to the notion of  $\mathbf{n}$ -regularity introduced in this section.

**Definition 4.** Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . We say that the function  $f$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular if the functions  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are linear combinations of box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex functions for every  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_{A'}$ .

**Remark 13.** Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ .

- (a) The set of all  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular functions is a linear subspace of the space of all real functions on  $\mathbf{I}$ .
- (b) If  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular,  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_{A'}$ , then  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is  $\mathbf{n}_A$ -regular.
- (c) Let  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function given by the formula  $f(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}_A) \cdot h(\mathbf{x}_{A'})$ , where  $g: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $h: \mathbf{I}_{A'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If  $g$  is  $\mathbf{n}_A$ -regular and  $h$  is  $\mathbf{n}_{A'}$ -regular, then  $f$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular (by Remark 7(b)).

**Lemma 14.** Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and let a pseudo-polynomial  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of degree  $\mathbf{n}$  be given by

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k.$$

If the functions  $A_{ik}$  are  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i$ , then the pseudo-polynomial  $W$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular.

If  $d > 2$ , then the converse theorem does not hold. See Remark 16.

*Proof.* Let  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i$  be fixed. Since  $I_i \ni x_i \mapsto x_i^k$  is box- $(n_i)$ -convex and  $A_{ik}: \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular, we obtain (by Remark 13(c)) that the function  $\mathbf{I} \ni \mathbf{x} \mapsto A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular. This implies that  $W(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular.  $\square$

The following lemma is a straightening of Lemma 10 for  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular functions.

**Lemma 15.** Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular function. For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , let  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{i, n_i+1}$  be pairwise distinct elements of  $I_i$ . Then for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  there exist  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular functions  $A_{i0}, A_{i1}, \dots, A_{i n_i}: \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the pseudo-polynomial

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$$

is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular, and

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) \quad (9)$$

for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i + 1$ .

*Proof.* Similarly to the proof of Lemma 10, we will define by induction functions  $g_i: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and pseudo-polynomials  $W_i: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . First we put  $g_i = f - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} W_j$ . Next, the pseudo-polynomial

$$W_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$$

such that  $g_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = W_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ , whenever  $x_i \in \{u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{i, n_i+1}\}$  is obtained using Lemma 9. (Note, that we use Lemma 9 with  $n_i + 1$  in place of  $n_i$ .)

By Lemma 9, Lemma 14 and Remark 13(b), we have that for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i$  the function  $A_{ik}$  is  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular as a linear combination of  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular functions  $(g_i)_{\{i\}'}^{u_{i1}}$ ,  $(g_i)_{\{i\}'}^{u_{i2}}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $(g_i)_{\{i\}'}^{u_{i, n_i+1}}$ .

Taking the pseudo-polynomial  $W = \sum_{i=1}^d W_i$ , we obtain that equation (9) is satisfied. By Lemma 14,  $W$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular. The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . A pseudo-polynomial  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of degree  $\mathbf{n}$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular if and only if for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  there exist  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular functions  $A_{ik}: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i$ ) such that

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k.$$

*Proof.* For the implication ( $\Leftarrow$ ) see Lemma 14. We need to show the implication ( $\Rightarrow$ ). For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , we choose arbitrary pairwise distinct  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{i, n_i+1} \in I_i$ . We apply Lemma 15 for the function  $W$  and we obtain the pseudo-polynomial  $W'(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}^c}) x_i^k$  with  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}^c}$ -regular coefficients  $A_{ik}$ . Since both  $W$  and  $W'$  are  $(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1, \dots, n_d + 1)$ -affine functions (by Theorem 12) and they satisfy (9), we obtain (by Proposition 4) that  $W = W'$ .  $\square$

**Remark 16.** According to Proposition 5, a pseudo-polynomial is regular if it has a representation with regular coefficients. However, for  $d \geq 3$ , every regular pseudo-polynomial has also representations with non-regular coefficients. For example the  $(1, 1, 1)$ -regular pseudo-polynomial  $W(x, y, z) = e^z \cdot x + e^x \cdot y + e^y \cdot z$  can be presented as  $W(x, y, z) = (e^z + h(z)y) \cdot x + (e^x - h(z)x) \cdot y + e^y \cdot z$ , where  $h$  is arbitrary.

**Theorem 17.** Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex function. For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , let  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}$  be pairwise distinct elements of  $I_i$ . If

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, u_{ij}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) = 0 \quad (10)$$

for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ , then  $f$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular.

*Proof.* Let  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_A$ . Let  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}$  be all elements of the set  $A$  and  $a'_1 < a'_2 < \dots < a'_{|A'|}$  be all elements of the set  $A'$ . We will show that the function  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is either box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex or box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -concave (in particular it is a linear combination of box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex functions).

Suppose that there exist  $k = 1, 2, \dots, |A'|$ ,  $i = a'_k$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$  such that  $z_k = u_{ij}$ . Then, by (10),  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}} = 0$ . Consequently,  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is both box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex and box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -concave.

In the remaining case, for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots, |A'|$  and  $i = a'_k$  the numbers  $z_k, u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i}$  are pairwise distinct elements of  $I_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}_i = (z_k, u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i})$ . For each  $i \in A$  let  $x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i}$  be pairwise distinct elements of  $I_i$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i})$ .

By Remark 3,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; f = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{a_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_2} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_{|A|}} \end{bmatrix}; g, \quad (11)$$

where  $g: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{a'_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{a'_2} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{a'_{|A'|}} \end{bmatrix}; f_{A'}^{\mathbf{x}}.$$

By (10) and by Proposition 3 applied to the function  $f_{A'}^{\mathbf{x}}$  we obtain

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{f_{A'}^{\mathbf{x}}(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{|A'|})}{\prod_{k=1}^{|A'|} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ (\text{for } i = a'_k)}}^{n_i} (z_k - u_{ij})} = \frac{f_A^{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{x})}{\prod_{k=1}^{|A'|} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ (\text{for } i = a'_k)}}^{n_i} (z_k - u_{ij})}.$$

It follows that (11) can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; f = \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{|A'|} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ (\text{for } i = a'_k)}}^{n_i} (z_k - u_{ij})} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{a_1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_2} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{a_{|A|}} \end{bmatrix}; f_A^{\mathbf{z}}.$$

The left side of the above equality is non-negative (because  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex), which implies that the above multiple divided difference of  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  has the same sign as the denominator. Consequently,  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex if the denominator is positive, and it is box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -concave if the denominator is negative. The proposition is proved.  $\square$

By Lemma 10 and Theorem 17, we obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex function. There exists a pseudo-polynomial  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of degree  $(n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$  such that  $f - W$  is an  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular and box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex function.*

**Lemma 18.** *Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ . For every  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular function  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  there exist two  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular and box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $g, h: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f = g - h$ .*

*Proof.* By Definition 4,  $f = \sum_{j=1}^J a_j f_j$ , where  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_J: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions. We put  $\tilde{g} = \sum_{j: a_j \geq 0} a_j f_j$  and  $\tilde{h} = \sum_{j: a_j < 0} (-a_j) f_j$ . Then  $f = \tilde{g} - \tilde{h}$  and both  $\tilde{g}$  and  $\tilde{h}$  are box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions. By Proposition 6, there exists box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine pseudo-polynomial  $W$  such that  $\tilde{g} - W$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular and box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex. Let  $g = \tilde{g} - W$  and  $h = \tilde{h} - W$ . Then both  $g$  and  $h$  are box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, and  $f = g - h$ . Since  $f$  and  $g$  are  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular, we obtain that  $h = g - f$  is also  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular.  $\square$

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^d$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and let  $u_{i1}, u_{i2}, \dots, u_{in_i} \in I_i$  be pairwise distinct. Assume that  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular function such that  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = 0$ , whenever  $x_i = u_{ij}$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ . Then there exist two  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular and box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $g, h: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f = g - h$  and  $g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = 0$ , whenever  $x_i = u_{ij}$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ .*

*Proof.* The proof of Lemma 19 is, essentially, the same as the proof of Lemma 18. The only difference is that, according to Lemma 10, we can choose the pseudo-polynomial  $W$  such that the following additional condition is satisfied:

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \tilde{g}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d), \text{ whenever } x_i = u_{ij} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i. \quad \square$$

## 6. INTEGRATION AND DIFFERENTIATION OF $\mathbf{n}$ -REGULAR FUNCTIONS

In this section we assume that all intervals  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_d$  are open intervals (bounded or unbounded).

**Lemma 20.** *Let  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  be fixed and  $\alpha_i \in I_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 2$  and let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular function.*

*Let  $\psi: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be right-derivative of  $f$  with respect to the  $i$ th variable, i.e.  $\psi$  is such that for every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'}$ , the function  $\psi_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is the right-derivative of  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$ . Then, the function  $\psi$  is well defined. Moreover,  $\psi$  is a  $(n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ -regular function, and it satisfies the equation  $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = f(x_1, \dots, \alpha_i, \dots, x_d) + \int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} \psi(x_1, \dots, t, \dots, x_d) dt$ , where  $t$  and  $\alpha_i$  stand at the  $i$ th position.*

*If, in addition,  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, then the function  $\psi$  is box- $(n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex.*

*Proof.* For every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'}$ , the function  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a linear combination of box- $(n_i)$ -convex functions. Taking into account Remark 6 and  $n_i \geq 2$ , we obtain that  $\psi$  is well defined and  $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}(x_i) = f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\alpha_i) + \int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} \psi_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}(t) dt$  for  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}$ .

First we show that if  $f$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular and box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, then  $\psi$  is box- $(n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex. Let  $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{k0}, x_{k1}, \dots, x_{kn_k}) \in I_k^{n_k+1}$  for  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \setminus \{i\}$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{in_i}) \in I_i^{n_i}$  be vectors with

pairwise distinct coordinates. Using Remark 3 and Lemma 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; \psi &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{i-1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{i+1} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; [\mathbf{x}_i; \psi_{\{i\}}] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{i-1} \\ \mathbf{x}_{i+1} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; [x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{in_i}; \psi_{\{i\}}] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{i-1} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \lim_{x_{i0} \downarrow x_{ij}} [x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i}; f_{\{i\}}] \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \lim_{x_{i0} \downarrow x_{ij}} \begin{bmatrix} x_{10} & x_{11}, \dots, & x_{1n_1} \\ x_{20} & x_{21}, \dots, & x_{2n_2}; f \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ x_{d0} & x_{d1}, \dots, & x_{dn_d} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

(the last inequality follows from the box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convexity of  $f$ ). We conclude that  $\psi$  is box- $(n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex.

Now we prove that  $\psi$  is  $(n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ -regular. We put  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} = (n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ . Let  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_{A'}$  be fixed. We need to show that  $\psi_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is a linear combination of box- $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions. Let  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|})$  be the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A$  (i.e.,  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$  and  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}$ ). Similarly, let  $(a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_{|A'|})$  be the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A'$ . We have two cases:  $i \in A$  or  $i \notin A$ .

First we consider the case  $i \in A$ . Then there exists  $l$  such that  $i = a_l$ . By Lemma 18, there exist two  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -regular and box- $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions  $g, h: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}} = g - h$ . Let  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  be right-derivatives of  $g$  and  $h$ , respectively, with respect to the  $l$ th variable. By the first part of the proof we obtain that  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  are box- $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions. Consequently,  $\psi_A^{\mathbf{z}} = \xi - \eta$  is a linear combination of box- $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions.

Now we pass to the case  $i \notin A$ . In that case  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A = \mathbf{n}_A$ . Since  $i \in A'$ , there exists  $l$  such that  $i = a'_l$ . We see that both  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  and  $\psi_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  do not depend on  $x_i$  (the  $i$ th variable of  $f$  and  $\psi$ ), which is fixed at  $z_l$ . We fix pairwise distinct  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n_i} \in I_i$  such that  $u_1 = z_l$ . By Lemma 9, there exists a pseudo-polynomial  $W$  of the form  $W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'})x_i^k$  such that  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ , whenever  $x_i = u_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ . Then the coefficients  $A_{i0}, A_{i1}, \dots, A_{i, n_i-1}$  are  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular functions. We denote  $\tilde{f} = f - W$ . Let  $\tilde{\psi}$  be a right-derivative of  $\tilde{f}$  with respect to the  $i$ th variable  $x_i$ . Then  $\tilde{\psi} = \psi - V$ , where  $V(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'})kx_i^{k-1}$ . Obviously, the pseudo-polynomial  $V$  is  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ -regular.

We consider the function  $f_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = (z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_{|A'|})$ . Without loss of generality (changing the order of variables, if necessary), we have  $f_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}: I_i \times \prod_{k \in A} I_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Using Lemma 19 we obtain two  $\mathbf{n}_{A \cup \{i\}}$ -regular and box- $\mathbf{n}_{A \cup \{i\}}$ -convex functions  $g, h: I_i \times \prod_{k \in A} I_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} = g - h$  and  $g(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{|A|}) = h(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{|A|}) = 0$ , whenever  $v_0 = u_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ .

Let  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  be right-derivatives of  $g$  and  $h$ , respectively, with respect to the variable  $v_0$ . By (4), for  $v_0 = u_1 = z_l$  we obtain

$$\xi_{\{0\}'}^{(u_1)}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) = \xi_{\{0\}'}^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(u_1) = \lim_{u_0 \downarrow u_1} [u_0, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n_i}; g_{\{0\}'}^{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}] \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{n_i} (u_1 - u_j),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|A|})$ . Analogous identity can be obtained for  $h$  and  $\eta$ .

For  $k = 1, 2, \dots, |A|$ , let  $v_{k0}, v_{k1}, \dots, v_{kn_{\alpha_k}} \in I_{\alpha_k}$  be pairwise distinct and let  $\mathbf{v}_k = (v_{k0}, v_{k1}, \dots, v_{kn_{\alpha_k}})$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix}; \xi_{\{0\}'}^{(u_1)} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix}; \lim_{u_0 \downarrow u_1} [u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{n_i}; g_{\{0\}}] \cdot \prod_{j=2}^{n_i} (u_1 - u_j) \\
&= \prod_{j=2}^{n_i} (u_1 - u_j) \cdot \lim_{u_0 \downarrow u_1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix}; [u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{n_i}; g_{\{0\}}] = \prod_{j=2}^{n_i} (u_1 - u_j) \cdot \lim_{u_0 \downarrow u_1} \begin{bmatrix} u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{n_i} \\ v_{10}, v_{11}, \dots, v_{1n_{a_1}} \\ \dots \\ v_{|A|0}, v_{|A|1}, \dots, v_{|A|n_{a_{|A|}}} \end{bmatrix}; g,
\end{aligned}$$

which has the same sign as  $\prod_{j=2}^{n_i} (u_1 - u_j)$  (by  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}_{A \cup \{i\}}$ -convexity of  $g$ ). It follows that  $\xi_{\{0\}'}^{(u_1)}$  is either  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex or  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}_A$ -concave. Analogously, we obtain that  $\eta_{\{0\}'}^{(u_1)}$  is either  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex or  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}_A$ -concave. Therefore the function  $\tilde{\psi}_A^{\mathbf{z}} = \xi_{\{0\}'}^{(u_1)} - \eta_{\{0\}'}^{(u_1)}$  is a linear combination of  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex functions. Taking into account  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A = \mathbf{n}_A$  and the equality  $\psi_A^{\mathbf{z}} = \tilde{\psi}_A^{\mathbf{z}} + V_A^{\mathbf{z}}$ , we see, that  $\psi_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is a linear combination of  $\text{box-}\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions.  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *Let  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  be fixed and  $\alpha_i \in I_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 1$  and let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular function.*

*Let  $F: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function given by the formula*

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} f(x_1, \dots, t, \dots, x_d) dt,$$

*where  $t$  stands at the  $i$ th position. Then  $F$  is well defined and it is an  $(n_1, \dots, n_i + 1, \dots, n_d)$ -regular function.*

*If, in addition,  $f$  is  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}$ -convex, then the function  $F$  is  $\text{box-}(n_1, \dots, n_i + 1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex.*

*Proof.* For every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'}$  the function  $f_{\{i\}'}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a linear combination of  $\text{box-}(n_i)$ -convex functions. Taking into account Remark 6 and  $n_i \geq 1$ , we obtain that  $F$  is well defined.

First we show that if  $f$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular and  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}$ -convex, then  $F$  is  $\text{box-}(n_1, \dots, n_i + 1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex. Let  $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{k0}, x_{k1}, \dots, x_{kn_k}) \in I_k^{n_k+1}$  for  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \setminus \{i\}$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i+1}) \in I_i^{n_i+2}$  be vectors with pairwise distinct coordinates. Using Remark 3 and Lemma 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix}; F &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{i-1}; [\mathbf{x}_i; F_{\{i\}}] \\ \mathbf{x}_{i+1} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{i-1}; [x_{i0}, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{in_i+1}; F_{\{i\}}] \\ \mathbf{x}_{i+1} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_{i-1}; \int_0^1 t^{n_i} [y_{1,t}, y_{2,t}, \dots, y_{n_i+1,t}; f_{\{i\}}] dt \\ \mathbf{x}_{i+1} \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{x}_d \end{bmatrix} = \int_0^1 t^{n_i} \begin{bmatrix} x_{10}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n_1} \\ \dots \\ y_{1,t}, y_{2,t}, \dots, y_{n_i+1,t}; f \\ \dots \\ x_{d0}, x_{d1}, \dots, x_{dn_d} \end{bmatrix} dt \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $y_{j,t} = tx_{ij} + (1-t)x_{i0}$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i + 1$ . The last inequality follows from the  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}$ -convexity of  $f$ . We conclude that  $F$  is  $\text{box-}(n_1, \dots, n_i + 1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex.

Now we prove that  $F$  is  $(n_1, \dots, n_i + 1, \dots, n_d)$ -regular. We put  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} = (n_1, \dots, n_i + 1, \dots, n_d)$ . Let  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_{A'}$  be fixed. We need to show that  $F_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is a linear combination of  $\text{box-}\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions. Let  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|})$  be the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A$  (i.e.,  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$  and  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}$ ). Similarly, let  $(a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_{|A'|})$  be the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A'$ . We have two cases:  $i \in A$  or  $i \notin A$ .

First we consider the case  $i \in A$ . Then there exists  $l$  such that  $i = a_l$ . By Lemma 18, there exist two  $\mathbf{n}_A$ -regular and  $\text{box-}\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex functions  $g, h: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}} = g - h$ . Let  $G(y_1, \dots, y_{|A|}) = \int_{\alpha_i}^{y_i} g(y_1, \dots, t, \dots, y_{|A|}) dt$  and  $H(y_1, \dots, y_{|A|}) = \int_{\alpha_i}^{y_i} h(y_1, \dots, t, \dots, y_{|A|}) dt$ , where  $t$  stands at the  $l$ th position. By the first part of the proof

we obtain that  $G$  and  $H$  are box- $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions. Consequently,  $F_A^{\mathbf{z}} = G - H$  is a linear combination of box- $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions.

Now we pass to the case  $i \notin A$ . In that case  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A = \mathbf{n}_A$ . Since  $i \in A'$ , there exists  $l$  such that  $i = a'_l$ . We see that both  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  and  $F_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  do not depend on  $x_i$  (the  $i$ th variable of  $f$  and  $F$ ), which is fixed at  $z_l$ . We fix pairwise distinct  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n_i} \in I_i$  such that  $u_j < \min(\alpha_i, z_l)$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ . By Lemma 9, there exists a pseudo-polynomial  $W$  of the form  $W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k$  such that  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ , whenever  $x_i = u_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ . Then the coefficients  $A_{i0}, A_{i1}, \dots, A_{i, n_i-1}$  are  $\mathbf{n}_{\{i\}'}$ -regular functions. We denote  $\tilde{f} = f - W$ . Let

$$\tilde{F}(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} \tilde{f}(x_1, \dots, t, \dots, x_d) dt,$$

where  $t$  stands at the  $i$ th position. Then  $\tilde{F} = F - V$ , where

$$V(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) \frac{x_i^{k+1} - \alpha_i^{k+1}}{k+1}.$$

Obviously, the pseudo-polynomial  $V$  is  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ -regular.

We consider the function  $\tilde{f}_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = (z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_{|A'|})$ . Without loss of generality (changing the order of variables, if necessary), we have  $\tilde{f}_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}: I_i \times \prod_{k \in A} I_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Using Lemma 19 we obtain two  $\mathbf{n}_{A \cup \{i\}}$ -regular and box- $\mathbf{n}_{A \cup \{i\}}$ -convex functions  $g, h: I_i \times \prod_{k \in A} I_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tilde{f}_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} = g - h$  and  $g(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{|A|}) = h(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{|A|}) = 0$ , whenever  $v_0 = u_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i$ . Let  $G(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{|A|}) = \int_{\alpha_i}^{y_0} g(t, y_1, \dots, y_{|A|}) dt$  and  $H(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{|A|}) = \int_{\alpha_i}^{y_0} h(t, y_1, \dots, y_{|A|}) dt$ .

For  $k = 1, 2, \dots, |A|$ , let  $v_{k0}, v_{k1}, \dots, v_{kn_{a_k}} \in I_{a_k}$  be pairwise distinct and let  $\mathbf{v}_k = (v_{k0}, v_{k1}, \dots, v_{kn_{a_k}})$ . By Remark 3 and (3), for every  $t$  between  $\alpha_i$  and  $z_l$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} t, u_1, \dots, u_{n_i} \\ v_{10}, v_{11}, \dots, v_{1n_{a_1}} \\ \dots \\ v_{|A|0}, v_{|A|1}, \dots, v_{|A|n_{a_{|A|}}} \end{bmatrix} ; g &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix} ; [t, u_1, \dots, u_{n_i}; g_{\{0\}}] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix} ; \frac{g_{\{0\}}^{(t)}}{\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} (t - u_j)} = \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} (t - u_j)} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix} ; g_{\{0\}}^{(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $t - u_j > t - \min(\alpha_i, z_l) \geq 0$  for each  $j$ , and  $g$  is box- $\mathbf{n}_{A \cup \{i\}}$ -convex, we obtain that  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix} ; g_{\{0\}}^{(t)} \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix} ; G_{\{0\}}^{(z_l)} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix} ; \int_{\alpha_i}^{z_l} g_{\{0\}}^{(t)} dt = \int_{\alpha_i}^{z_l} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{v}_{|A|} \end{bmatrix} ; g_{\{0\}}^{(t)} dt$$

is either non-negative (if  $z_l \geq \alpha_i$ ) or non-positive (if  $z_l < \alpha_i$ ). Consequently,  $G_{\{0\}}^{(z_l)}$  is box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex or box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -concave. Similarly,  $H_{\{0\}}^{(z_l)}$  is box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex or box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -concave. Therefore the function  $\tilde{F}_A^{\mathbf{z}} = G_{\{0\}}^{(z_l)} - H_{\{0\}}^{(z_l)}$  is a linear combination of box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex functions. Taking into account  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A = \mathbf{n}_A$  and the equality  $F_A^{\mathbf{z}} = \tilde{F}_A^{\mathbf{z}} + V_A^{\mathbf{z}}$ , we see, that  $F_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is a linear combination of box- $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_A$ -convex functions.  $\square$

## 7. INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION OF BOX-MONOTONE FUNCTIONS

In this section, we study box- $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -convex functions. We will call them *box-monotone* functions. Our aim is to present the integral representation of box-monotone functions. The general idea is based on the observation that box-monotone functions behave similarly to cumulative distribution functions of probability distributions.

However, while cumulative distribution functions are always bounded and right-continuous (or left-continuous), box-monotone functions, in general, do not have these properties.

We start from some results concerning real functions of one variable.

Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an open interval and  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function with locally finite variation (which is equivalent to  $f$  being a difference of two non-decreasing functions). For  $x \in I$  we denote one-side limits of  $f$  at  $x$  as  $f(x-) = \lim_{u \uparrow x} f(u)$  and  $f(x+) = \lim_{u \downarrow x} f(u)$ . We say that  $f$  is a *jump function* if for every  $x, y \in I$ ,  $x < y$ , we have

$$f(y-) - f(x+) = \sum_{x < t < y} (f(t+) - f(t-)). \quad (12)$$

Note that our assumption that the function  $f$  has locally finite variation implies that  $f(t+) - f(t-) = 0$  for all but countably many  $t \in (x, y)$ , and  $\sum_{x < t < y} |f(t+) - f(t-)| < \infty$ .

In the following lemma, we obtain a decomposition of a function with locally finite variation, which is a counterpart of the well known Lebesgue decomposition of right-continuous functions with finite variation.

**Lemma 22.** *Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an open interval and let  $\alpha \in I$  be fixed. For a function  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with locally finite variation, there exist unique functions  $f_L, f_R, f_c: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_L$  and  $f_R$  are jump functions,  $f_L(\alpha) = f_R(\alpha) = 0$ ,  $f_L$  is a left-continuous function,  $f_R$  is a right-continuous function,  $f_c$  is a continuous function, and  $f = f_L + f_R + f_c$ .*

*Moreover, if the function  $f$  is non-decreasing, then the functions  $f_L, f_R$  and  $f_c$  are also non-decreasing.*

*Proof.* First we show that whenever the functions  $f_L, f_R$  and  $f_c$  satisfying the conditions given in the lemma exist, then they are unique. Assume that for some  $f$  there are two such triplets:  $f_L, f_R, f_c$ , and  $\tilde{f}_L, \tilde{f}_R, \tilde{f}_c$ . Then the functions  $g_L = f_L - \tilde{f}_L$ ,  $g_R = f_R - \tilde{f}_R$  and  $g_c = f_c - \tilde{f}_c$  form a triplet for the function  $g = f - f = 0$ . It is enough to show that  $g_L = g_R = g_c = 0$ . Since  $g_L = g - g_R - g_c = -g_R - g_c$ , we obtain that  $g_L$  is not only left-continuous, but also right-continuous, hence it is continuous. Let  $x, y \in I$ ,  $x < y$ . Since  $g_L$  is a continuous jump function, we have

$$g_L(y) - g_L(x) = g_L(y-) - g_L(x+) = \sum_{x < t < y} (g_L(t+) - g_L(t-)) = 0.$$

Therefore  $g_L$  is constant. Taking into account the condition  $g_L(\alpha) = 0$ , we get  $g_L = 0$ . Similarly,  $g_R = 0$ . Consequently,  $g_c = g - g_L - g_R = 0$ .

We will show that the following functions  $f_L, f_R$  and  $f_c$  satisfy the conditions given in the lemma.

$$\begin{aligned} f_L(x) &= \sum_{\alpha \leq t < x} (f(t+) - f(t)) - \sum_{x \leq t < \alpha} (f(t+) - f(t)), \\ f_R(x) &= \sum_{\alpha < t \leq x} (f(t) - f(t-)) - \sum_{x < t \leq \alpha} (f(t) - f(t-)), \\ f_c(x) &= f(x) - f_L(x) - f_R(x). \end{aligned}$$

The above functions are well defined because the function  $f$  has locally finite variation. Clearly,  $f_L(\alpha) = f_R(\alpha) = 0$  and  $f = f_L + f_R + f_c$ .

For  $x, y \in I$ ,  $x < y$  we have

$$f_L(y) - f_L(x) = \sum_{x \leq t < y} (f(t+) - f(t)) \text{ and } f_R(y) - f_R(x) = \sum_{x < t \leq y} (f(t) - f(t-)). \quad (13)$$

It follows that for every  $x \in I$  we have

$$f_L(x) - f_L(x-) = \lim_{u \uparrow x} (f_L(x) - f_L(u)) = \lim_{u \uparrow x} \sum_{u \leq t < x} (f(t+) - f(t)) = 0,$$

$$f_L(x+) - f_L(x) = \lim_{u \downarrow x} (f_L(u) - f_L(x)) = \lim_{u \downarrow x} \sum_{x \leq t < u} (f(t+) - f(t)) = f(x+) - f(x).$$

Similarly, for every  $x \in I$  we have  $f_R(x+) - f_R(x) = 0$  and  $f_R(x) - f_R(x-) = f(x) - f(x-)$ . It follows that  $f_L$  is left-continuous and  $f_R$  is right-continuous. Moreover, for every  $x \in I$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_c(x+) - f_c(x) &= (f(x+) - f(x)) - (f_L(x+) - f_L(x)) - (f_R(x+) - f_R(x)) = 0, \\ f_c(x) - f_c(x-) &= (f(x) - f(x-)) - (f_L(x) - f_L(x-)) - (f_R(x) - f_R(x-)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence  $f_c$  is continuous.

Now we show that  $f_L$  and  $f_R$  are jump functions. Let  $x, y \in I$ ,  $x < y$ . For every  $t \in (x, y)$  we have

$$f_L(t+) - f_L(t-) = f_L(t+) - f_L(t) = f(t+) - f(t).$$

By (13) and left-continuity of  $f_L$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x < t < y} (f_L(t+) - f_L(t-)) &= \sum_{x < t < y} (f(t+) - f(t)) = (f_L(y) - f_L(x)) - (f(x+) - f(x)) \\ &= (f_L(y) - f_L(x)) - (f_L(x+) - f_L(x)) = f_L(y-) - f_L(x+), \end{aligned}$$

hence  $f_L$  is a jump function. Similarly, we obtain that  $f_R$  is a jump function.

Now we assume that  $f$  is non-decreasing. By (13), we immediately obtain that the functions  $f_L$  and  $f_R$  are non-decreasing. We will prove that  $f_c$  is also non-decreasing. Aiming at the contradiction, we assume that there exist  $x, y \in I$  such that  $x < y$  and  $f_c(x) > f_c(y)$ . The inequality  $f_c(x) > f_c(y)$  can be written as

$$(f_L(y) - f_L(x)) + (f_R(y) - f_R(x)) > f(y) - f(x).$$

By (13), we get

$$\sum_{x < t < y} (f(t+) - f(t-)) > f(y-) - f(x+).$$

Then there exist  $x < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n < y$  such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (f(t_k+) - f(t_k-)) > f(y-) - f(x+),$$

and, consequently, there exist  $x < u_0 < t_1 < u_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n < u_n < y$  such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (f(u_k) - f(u_{k-1})) > \sum_{k=1}^n (f(t_k+) - f(t_k-)) > f(y-) - f(x+).$$

We obtained a contradiction, which implies that  $f_c$  is non-decreasing.  $\square$

In the sequel we may continue to deal with the decomposition  $f = f_L + f_R + f_c$  given by Lemma 22. However, for simplicity, we will use the decomposition of  $f$  to two functions, given by the following corollary.

**Corollary 23.** *Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an open interval and let  $\alpha \in I$  be fixed. For a function  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with locally finite variation, there exist unique functions  $f_L, f_r: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_L$  is a left-continuous jump function and  $f_r$  is a right-continuous function such that  $f_L(\alpha) = 0$  and  $f = f_L + f_r$ .*

*Moreover, if the function  $f$  is non-decreasing, then the functions  $f_L$  and  $f_r$  are also non-decreasing.*

*Proof.* Let  $f_L, f_R$  and  $f_c$  be given by Lemma 22. We put  $f_r = f_R + f_c$ . The uniqueness can be proven similarly as in the proof of Lemma 22.  $\square$

**Remark 24.** *Note that the operations  $\cdot_L, \cdot_R, \cdot_c$  and  $\cdot_r$  are linear operators. To see it, one can use the explicit formulas presented in Corollary 23 and the proof of Lemma 22. Moreover, we have  $(f_L)_L = f_L$ ,  $(f_R)_R = f_R$ ,  $(f_c)_c = f_c$  and  $(f_r)_r = f_r$ . It follows that all the considered operators are linear projections in the space of functions with locally finite variation. In particular,  $(f_L)_r = f_L - (f_L)_L = 0$ . Similarly,  $(f_r)_L = f_r - (f_r)_r = 0$ .*

We are ready to investigate box-monotone functions of  $d$  variables. First we need to extend the decomposition presented in Corollary 23 to functions of many variables. If a function  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular, then for every  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}}$ , the function  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is the function of one variable with locally finite variation. It follows that the following definition is valid.

**Definition 5.** Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular function. For  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $\alpha_i \in I_i$ , we define the functions  $f_{(i,L)}, f_{(i,r)}: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows: for every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}}$ , we put  $(f_{(i,L)})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}} = (f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}})_L$  and  $(f_{(i,r)})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}} = (f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}})_r$ .

**Remark 25.** Intuitively, in Definition 5 we apply operation  $\cdot_L$  or  $\cdot_r$  to the  $i$ th variable of the function  $f$ . Note that  $f = f_{(i,L)} + f_{(i,r)}$  and for every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}}$ , we have that  $(f_{(i,L)})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a left-continuous jump function,  $(f_{(i,r)})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a right-continuous function, and  $(f_{(i,L)})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\alpha_i) = 0$ . According to Corollary 23,  $f_{(i,L)}$  and  $f_{(i,r)}$  are the unique functions satisfying the above conditions. Moreover, by Remark 24, we have that  $\cdot_{(i,L)}$  and  $\cdot_{(i,r)}$  are linear operators satisfying  $(f_{(i,L)})_{(i,L)} = f_{(i,L)}$ ,  $(f_{(i,r)})_{(i,r)} = f_{(i,r)}$  and  $(f_{(i,L)})_{(i,r)} = (f_{(i,r)})_{(i,L)} = 0$ .

**Lemma 26.** Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular function. For every  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\alpha_i \in I_i$  the functions  $f_{(i,L)}, f_{(i,r)}: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular.

If, in addition,  $f$  is box-monotone, then the functions  $f_{(i,L)}$  and  $f_{(i,r)}$  are also box-monotone.

*Proof.* First, we prove that if  $f$  is  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular and box-monotone, then the functions  $f_{(i,L)}$  and  $f_{(i,r)}$  are box-monotone. Let  $g$  be any of the functions  $f$ ,  $f_{(i,L)}$  and  $f_{(i,r)}$ . The function  $g$  is box-monotone, if for every vectors  $(x_{10}, x_{11}) \in I_1^2, \dots, (x_{d0}, x_{d1}) \in I_d^2$  with pairwise distinct coordinates, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{10}, & x_{11} \\ x_{20}, & x_{21} \\ \dots & \\ x_{d0}, & x_{d1} \end{bmatrix}; g = [x_{i0}, x_{i1}; \tilde{g}] \geq 0,$$

where the function  $\tilde{g}: I_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$\tilde{g}(x_i) := \begin{bmatrix} x_{10}, & x_{11} \\ \dots & \\ x_{i-1,0}, & x_{i-1,1}, & (x_i) \\ x_{i+1,0}, & x_{i+1,1} \\ \dots & \\ x_{d0}, & x_{d1} \end{bmatrix}; g_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}.$$

The above inequality implies that the function  $g$  is box-monotone if and only if  $\tilde{g}$  is non-decreasing (for every  $(x_{10}, x_{11}), \dots, (x_{i-1,0}, x_{i-1,1}), (x_{i+1,0}, x_{i+1,1}), \dots, (x_{d0}, x_{d1})$ ). By the expanded form of  $\tilde{g}$  given by Proposition 3, the function  $\tilde{g}$  is a linear combination of functions of the form  $g_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  (with the coefficients and  $\mathbf{y}$ 's depending on  $(x_{10}, x_{11}), \dots, (x_{i-1,0}, x_{i-1,1}), (x_{i+1,0}, x_{i+1,1}), \dots, (x_{d0}, x_{d1})$  only). Thus, by the linearity of  $\cdot_L$ ,  $\cdot_r$ ,  $\cdot_{(i,L)}$  and  $\cdot_{(i,r)}$ , we obtain that  $\widetilde{f_{(i,L)}} = (\tilde{f})_L$  and  $\widetilde{f_{(i,r)}} = (\tilde{f})_r$ . Using Corollary 23 and the fact that  $\tilde{f}$  is non-decreasing, we obtain that the functions  $\widetilde{f_{(i,L)}}$  and  $\widetilde{f_{(i,r)}}$  are non-decreasing. We end up with the conclusion that the functions  $f_{(i,L)}$  and  $f_{(i,r)}$  are box-monotone.

Now, we prove the  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regularity of  $f_{(i,L)}$  and  $f_{(i,r)}$ . Since  $f_{(i,r)} = f - f_{(i,L)}$ , it is enough to show the  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regularity of  $f_{(i,L)}$ . Let  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_{A'}$  be fixed. We need to show that  $(f_{(i,L)})_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  is a linear combination of box-monotone functions. Let  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|})$  be the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A$  (i.e.,  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$  and  $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}$ ). Similarly, let  $(a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_{|A'|})$  be the ordered sequence of the elements of  $A'$ . We have two cases:  $i \in A$  or  $i \notin A$ .

First we consider the case  $i \in A$ . Then there exists  $l$  such that  $i = a_l$ . By Lemma 18, there exist two  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular and box-monotone functions  $g, h: \mathbf{I}_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}} = g - h$ . By the first part of the proof, we obtain that  $g_{(l,L)}$  and  $h_{(l,L)}$  are box-monotone functions. Consequently,  $(f_{(i,L)})_A^{\mathbf{z}} = g_{(l,L)} - h_{(l,L)}$  is a linear combination of box-monotone functions.

Now we pass to the case  $i \notin A$ . Since  $i \in A'$ , there exists  $l$  such that  $i = a'_l$ . We see that both  $f_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  and  $(f_{(i,L)})_A^{\mathbf{z}}$  do not depend on  $x_i$  (the  $i$ th variable of  $f$  and  $f_{(i,L)}$ ), which is fixed at  $z_l$ . If  $z_l = \alpha_i$ , then  $(f_{(i,L)})_A^{\mathbf{z}} = 0$  is a box-monotone function. In the sequel, we assume that  $z_l \neq \alpha_i$ .

We consider the function  $f_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = (z_1, \dots, z_{l-1}, z_{l+1}, \dots, z_{|A'|})$ . Without loss of generality (changing the order of variables, if necessary), we have  $f_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}: I_i \times \prod_{k \in A} I_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Using Lemma 19, we obtain two  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular and box-monotone functions  $g, h: I_i \times \prod_{k \in A} I_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_{A \cup \{i\}}^{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} = g - h$  and we have  $g(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{|A|}) = h(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{|A|}) = 0$  whenever  $v_0 = \alpha_i$  (we number the variables of  $g$  and  $h$  starting from 0).

For  $k = 1, 2, \dots, |A|$ , let  $v_{k0}, v_{k1} \in I_{a_k}$  be pairwise distinct. By the first part of the proof, we obtain that  $g_{(0,L)}$  is the box-monotone function. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \begin{bmatrix} z_l, \alpha_i \\ v_{10}, v_{11} \\ \dots \\ v_{|A|0}, v_{|A|1} \end{bmatrix}; g_{(0,L)} &= \frac{\begin{bmatrix} v_{10}, v_{11} \\ \dots \\ v_{|A|0}, v_{|A|1} \end{bmatrix}; (g_{(0,L)})_{\{0\}'}^{(z_l)} - \begin{bmatrix} v_{10}, v_{11} \\ \dots \\ v_{|A|0}, v_{|A|1} \end{bmatrix}; (g_{(0,L)})_{\{0\}'}^{(\alpha_i)}}{z_l - \alpha_i} \\ &= \frac{1}{z_l - \alpha_i} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} v_{10}, v_{11} \\ \dots \\ v_{|A|0}, v_{|A|1} \end{bmatrix}; (g_{(0,L)})_{\{0\}'}^{(z_l)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the sign of the last divided difference depends only on the sign of  $z_l - \alpha_i$ . Consequently,  $(g_{(0,L)})_{\{0\}'}^{(z_l)}$  is either box- $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -convex or box- $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -concave. Similarly, we can obtain that  $(h_{(0,L)})_{\{0\}'}^{(z_l)}$  is either box- $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -convex or box- $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -concave. We end up with the conclusion that  $(f_{(i,L)})_A^{\mathbf{z}} = (g_{(0,L)})_{\{0\}'}^{(z_l)} - (h_{(0,L)})_{\{0\}'}^{(z_l)}$  is a linear combination of box- $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -convex functions. The proof is finished.  $\square$

**Lemma 27.** *Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular function and let  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  be fixed. If  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $a, b \in \{L, r\}$ , then  $f_{(i,a)(j,b)} = f_{(j,b)(i,a)}$ .*

By  $f_{(i,a)(j,b)}$  we mean  $(f_{(i,a)})_{(j,b)}$ . The same convention applies in other cases.

*Proof.* If  $i = j$ , then the lemma follows from Remark 25.

First we show that the conclusion of the lemma holds for  $a = b = L$ . It is enough to prove that for every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i,j\}'}$  and for  $\tilde{f} = f_{\{i,j\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  we have  $\tilde{f}_{(1,L)(2,L)} = \tilde{f}_{(2,L)(1,L)}$ . By Lemma 18, there exist two  $(1, 1)$ -regular and box-monotone functions  $g, h: I_i \times I_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tilde{f} = g - h$ .

Since  $g$  is box-monotone, by Lemma 26, we obtain that both functions  $g_{(1,L)(2,L)(1,r)}$  and  $g_{(1,L)(2,r)(1,r)}$  are box-monotone. Therefore

$$g_{(1,L)(2,L)(1,r)} = (g_{(1,L)(2,L)} + g_{(1,L)(2,r)})_{(1,r)} - g_{(1,L)(2,r)(1,r)} = g_{(1,L)(1,r)} - g_{(1,L)(2,r)(1,r)} = -g_{(1,L)(2,r)(1,r)}$$

is a box- $(1, 1)$ -affine function. Similarly (exchanging all  $\cdot_{(1,L)}$  and  $\cdot_{(1,r)}$ ), we obtain that  $g_{(1,r)(2,L)(1,L)}$  is box- $(1, 1)$ -affine. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{(2,L)(1,L)} - g_{(1,L)(2,L)} &= (g_{(1,L)} + g_{(1,r)})_{(2,L)(1,L)} - (g_{(1,L)(2,L)(1,L)} + g_{(1,L)(2,L)(1,r)}) \\ &= g_{(1,r)(2,L)(1,L)} - g_{(1,L)(2,L)(1,r)} \end{aligned}$$

is also box- $(1, 1)$ -affine. On the other hand, we have  $g_{(2,L)(1,L)}(v_1, v_2) = 0 = g_{(1,L)(2,L)}(v_1, v_2)$ , whenever  $v_1 = \alpha_i$  or  $v_2 = \alpha_j$ . By Proposition 4, we get  $g_{(2,L)(1,L)} = g_{(1,L)(2,L)}$ . Similarly, we obtain  $h_{(2,L)(1,L)} = h_{(1,L)(2,L)}$ . Consequently,  $\tilde{f}_{(2,L)(1,L)} = \tilde{f}_{(1,L)(2,L)}$  and  $f_{(i,L)(j,L)} = f_{(j,L)(i,L)}$ .

We proved one of the four required identities. We use it to prove the other three:

$$f_{(i,L)(j,r)} = f_{(i,L)} - f_{(i,L)(j,L)} = f_{(i,L)} - f_{(j,L)(i,L)} = f_{(j,r)(i,L)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_{(i,r)(j,L)} &= f_{(j,L)} - f_{(i,L)(j,L)} = f_{(j,L)} - f_{(j,L)(i,L)} = f_{(j,L)(i,r)}, \\ f_{(i,r)(j,r)} &= f_{(j,r)} - f_{(i,L)(j,r)} = f_{(j,r)} - f_{(j,r)(i,L)} = f_{(j,r)(i,r)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

In the following theorem we study a  $d$ -dimensional counterpart of the decomposition introduced in Definition 5.

**Theorem 28.** *Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular function and let  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  be fixed. There exist unique  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular functions  $f_{\mathbf{b}}$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_d) \in \{L, r\}^d$ , such that*

$$f = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} f_{\mathbf{b}},$$

and for every  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}}$ , we have:

- (a) if  $b_i = L$ , then  $(f_{\mathbf{b}})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a left-continuous jump function,  $(f_{\mathbf{b}})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\alpha_i) = 0$ ,
- (b) if  $b_i = r$ , then  $(f_{\mathbf{b}})_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a right-continuous function.

If, in addition,  $f$  is box-monotone, then the functions  $f_{\mathbf{b}}$  are also box-monotone.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_d) \in \{L, r\}^d$ . We consider the functions  $f_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, d$ , defined inductively as follows:  $f_{(b_1)} = f_{(1, b_1)}$  and  $f_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k)} = (f_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{k-1})})_{(k, b_k)}$ ,  $k = 2, \dots, d$ . We will check that  $f_{\mathbf{b}} = f_{(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_d)}$  satisfies the required conditions.

By Lemma 26, the functions  $f_{\mathbf{b}}$  are  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular. If, in addition,  $f$  is box-monotone, then the functions  $f_{\mathbf{b}}$  are also box-monotone. By Remark 25, we have

$$f = \sum_{b_1 \in \{L, r\}} f_{(b_1)} = \sum_{b_1, b_2 \in \{L, r\}} f_{(b_1, b_2)} = \dots = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} f_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

By Lemma 27, and the last part of Remark 25, we also have  $f_{\mathbf{b}} = (f_{\mathbf{b}})_{(i, b_i)}$ . Consequently, conditions (a) and (b) of the theorem are satisfied.

It remains to prove the uniqueness of the functions  $f_{\mathbf{b}}$ . We will show by induction on  $k = 0, 1, \dots, d$ , that for every for  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \{L, r\}$  the function

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d \\ (b_1, \dots, b_k) = (a_1, \dots, a_k)}} f_{\mathbf{b}} \tag{14}$$

is uniquely determined. For  $k = 0$  the expression (14) is equal to  $f$ . In the induction step (for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ ) we observe that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d \\ (b_1, \dots, b_k) = (a_1, \dots, a_k)}} f_{\mathbf{b}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d \\ (b_1, \dots, b_k) = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \\ b_{k+1} = L}} f_{\mathbf{b}} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d \\ (b_1, \dots, b_k) = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \\ b_{k+1} = r}} f_{\mathbf{b}}$$

is the decomposition of expression (14) to its  $\cdot_{(k+1, L)}$  and  $\cdot_{(k+1, r)}$  part. By Remark 25, this decomposition is unique. Consequently, for  $k = d$  we obtain the uniqueness of the functions  $f_{\mathbf{b}}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 6.** *For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $b \in \{L, r\}$ , we define the function  $\chi_{x, y}^b: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{x, y}^L(u) &= \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, y)}(u) - \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x)}(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq u < y, \\ -1 & \text{if } y \leq u < x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \chi_{x, y}^r(u) &= \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, y]}(u) - \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x]}(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x < u \leq y, \\ -1 & \text{if } y < u \leq x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 29.** Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Let  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_d) \in \{L, r\}^d$  and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  be fixed. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- The function  $f$  is a  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular and box-monotone such that for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}'}$ , we have:
  - (a) if  $b_i = L$ , then  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a left-continuous jump function,
  - (b) if  $b_i = r$ , then  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a right-continuous function,
  - (c)  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}(\alpha_i) = 0$ .
- There exists a Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbf{I}$  such that
  - (i)

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d),$$

- (ii)  $\mu(K) < \infty$  for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbf{I}$ ,
- (iii) for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , if  $b_i = L$ , then the marginal measure of  $\mu$ , corresponding to the  $i$ th coordinate is a discrete measure.

Moreover, the measure  $\mu$  that appears in representation (i) is unique.

*Proof.* First we prove the implication  $(\Leftarrow)$ .

By (i) and (ii), we obtain that  $f(x_1, \dots, x_d)$  is finite for every  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ . Moreover,  $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = 0$ , whenever  $x_j = \alpha_j$  for some  $j$ . Therefore condition (c) is satisfied.

For  $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $y < z$ , and  $b \in \{L, r\}$  we define

$$J_{y,z}^b = \begin{cases} [y, z] & \text{if } b = L, \\ (y, z] & \text{if } b = r. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

For  $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$  we take arbitrary points  $y_j, z_j \in I_j$ ,  $y_j < z_j$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \left( \prod_{j=1}^d J_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j} \right) &= \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d (\chi_{\alpha_j, z_j}^{b_j}(u_j) - \chi_{\alpha_j, y_j}^{b_j}(u_j)) d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ &= \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|B|} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{\alpha_j, \hat{y}_{B,j}}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ &= \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|B|} f(\hat{y}_{B,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{B,d}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{y}_{B,j} = y_j$  for  $j \in B$ , and  $\hat{y}_{B,j} = z_j$  for  $j \notin B$ . On the other hand, by (5) for  $n_1 = \dots = n_d = 1$ , we obtain

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} y_1, z_1 \\ y_2, z_2 \\ \dots \\ y_d, z_d \end{array}; f \right] = \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} \frac{f(\hat{y}_{B,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{B,d})}{\prod_{i=j}^d (\hat{y}_{B,j} - \hat{y}_{B',j})} = \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^d (z_j - y_j)} \cdot \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|B|} f(\hat{y}_{B,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{B,d}).$$

Consequently,

$$\mu \left( \prod_{j=1}^d J_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j} \right) = \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|B|} f(\hat{y}_{B,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{B,d}) = \prod_{j=1}^d (z_j - y_j) \cdot \left[ \begin{array}{c} y_1, z_1 \\ y_2, z_2 \\ \dots \\ y_d, z_d \end{array}; f \right]. \quad (16)$$

It follows that the divided difference that appears in (16) is non-negative. Since  $y_j < z_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$ ) were chosen arbitrarily, the function  $f$  is box-monotone.

By the box-monotonicity of  $f$ , condition (c) and Theorem 17, we obtain that  $f$  is  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -regular.

Now, we will show that condition (b) is satisfied. Let  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  be fixed. Assume that  $b_i = r$ . The functions  $g_{x_1, \dots, x_d} : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by formula  $g_{x_1, \dots, x_d}(u_1, \dots, u_d) = \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j)$  are obviously bounded. Observe, that if  $x_i \downarrow \hat{x}_i$ , then  $\chi_{\alpha_i, x_i}^r$  is pointwise convergent to  $\chi_{\alpha_i, \hat{x}_i}^r$ . Thus,  $g_{x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_d}$  converges to  $g_{x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_d}$  pointwise. Consequently, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$\lim_{x_i \downarrow \hat{x}_i} f(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_d) = f(x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_d),$$

therefore condition (b) holds.

Similarly, one can prove that if  $b_i = L$ , then  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a left-continuous function for every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{I}_{\{i\}}$ . We will show that  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a jump function. We consider only the case when  $y_j \geq \alpha_j$  for all  $j \neq i$  (all the other cases are similar). Let  $x < y$ ,  $x, y \in I_i$ . By condition (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(y-) - f(x+) &= \mu \left( \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} J_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j} \times (x, y) \times \prod_{j=i+1}^d J_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j} \right) = \sum_{x < t < y} \mu \left( \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} J_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j} \times \{t\} \times \prod_{j=i+1}^d J_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j} \right) \\ &= \sum_{x < t < y} (f(t+) - f(t-)). \end{aligned}$$

We obtained that equation (12) holds for each  $x < y$ , which implies that  $f_{\{i\}}^{\mathbf{y}}$  is a jump function. This completes the proof of condition (a).

Now, we are going to the proof of the implication  $(\Rightarrow)$ .

We need to define the measure  $\mu$ . First, by formula (16), we define  $\mu$  for the rectangles of the form  $\prod_{j=1}^d J_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j}$ , where  $y_j, z_j \in I_j$ ,  $y_j < z_j$ , and  $J_{y, z}^b$  is given by (15). Using the standard methods, we may uniquely extend  $\mu$  to a Borel measure on  $\mathbf{I}$ . In this step, the assumptions on one-sided continuity of  $f$  ((a) and (b)) play an important role. We omit the details of the proof of the extension. Note, that every measure  $\mu$  satisfying condition (i) needs to fulfill equality (16) for all rectangles. Thus,  $\mu$  is uniquely determined.

If  $K \subset \mathbf{I}$  is compact, then it is a subset of some rectangle  $\mathbf{J} = \prod_{j=1}^d J_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j}$ . Therefore,  $\mu(K) \leq \mu(\mathbf{J}) < \infty$ , which proves (ii).

We will show (i). Let  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ . For each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$  we put  $(y_j, z_j) = (\min(x_j, \alpha_j), \max(x_j, \alpha_j))$ . Note that if  $y_j = \alpha_j$ , then  $\chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j} = \chi_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j}$ . Otherwise, we have  $\chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j} = -\chi_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j}$ . Consequently, letting  $k = |\{j : x_j < \alpha_j\}|$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d) &= (-1)^k \int_{\mathbf{I}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ &= (-1)^k \mu \left( \prod_{j=1}^d J_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j} \right) = (-1)^k \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|B|} f(\hat{y}_{B,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{B,d}). \end{aligned}$$

Using (c), we obtain that the only non-zero summand in the last sum is the one for  $B = \{j : x_j < \alpha_j\}$ . This summand equals  $(-1)^{|B|} f(\hat{y}_{B,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{B,d}) = (-1)^k f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ . Therefore, we obtain (i).

It remains to show (iii). We fix  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  such that  $b_i = L$ . By the definition of  $\mu$  and formula (16), condition (a) implies that the function  $z_i \mapsto \mu \left( \prod_{j=1}^d J_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j} \right)$  is a jump function. Thus, we have that the  $i$ th marginal of  $\mu$  restricted to any rectangle of the form  $\prod_{j=1}^d J_{y_j, z_j}^{b_j}$  is a discrete measure. Consequently, condition (iii) is satisfied.  $\square$

**Theorem 30.** *Let  $f : \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  be fixed. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- $f$  is box-monotone,

- there exist a pseudo-polynomial  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the degree  $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$  and Borel measures  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$  on  $\mathbf{I}$  ( $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$ ) such that
  - (i)

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, \dots, x_d) + \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d), \quad (17)$$

- (ii)  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(K) < \infty$  for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$ ,
- (iii) for each  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$  and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , if  $b_i = L$ , then the marginal measure of  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$ , corresponding to the  $i$ th coordinate is a discrete measure.

Moreover, for a box-monotone function  $f$ , the pseudopolynomial  $W$  and the measures  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$  in the representation (17) are uniquely determined.

*Proof.* If the function  $f$  is of the form (17), then, by Theorems 12 and 29, it is box-monotone as a sum of box-monotone functions. The proof of the implication  $(\Leftarrow)$  is completed.

The implication  $(\Rightarrow)$  is an immediate consequence of Lemma 10 and Theorems 17, 28 and 29.

Now, we will prove the uniqueness of the representation. Assume that (17) holds both for  $W$ ,  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\hat{W}$ ,  $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{b}}$  ( $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$ ). Then we have

$$(\hat{W} - W)(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d(\mu_{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{b}})(u_1, \dots, u_d).$$

We obtain that  $\hat{W} - W$  is a pseudo-polynomial of the degree  $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$  such that  $(\hat{W} - W)(x_1, \dots, x_d) = 0$ , whenever  $x_i = \alpha_i$  for some  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . By Proposition 4, it follows that  $W = \hat{W}$ . Consequently, by Theorem 28, all the summands on the right side are zero functions, and by Theorem 29,  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}} = \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{b}}$  for all  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$ . This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 31.** Note, that each  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$  the summand corresponding to  $\mathbf{b}$  in the representation (17) can be regarded as a generalized cumulative distribution function of the measure  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$ .

Let us consider the case, when all the measures  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$  are finite, which is equivalent to the existence of  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for arbitrary points  $y_j, z_j \in I_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$  we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^d (z_j - y_j) \cdot \left[ \begin{array}{c} y_1, z_1 \\ y_2, z_2 \\ \dots \\ y_d, z_d \end{array}; f \right] = \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|B|} f(\hat{y}_{B,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{B,d}) < M, \quad (18)$$

where  $\hat{y}_{B,j} = y_j$  for  $j \in B$ , and  $\hat{y}_{B,j} = z_j$  for  $j \notin B$ . In that case formula (17) can be written using probabilistic tools.

Let  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$  and let  $c_{\mathbf{b}} = \mu_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{I}) < \infty$ . There exists a random vector  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{b}} = (X_{\mathbf{b},1}, \dots, X_{\mathbf{b},d})$  such that  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}/c_{\mathbf{b}}$  is the probability distribution of the vector  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{b}}$ , whenever  $c_{\mathbf{b}} > 0$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} (19) \quad & \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d) = c_{\mathbf{b}} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d (\mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x_j)}(u_j) - \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, \alpha_j)}(u_j)) dP_{\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{b}}}(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ & = c_{\mathbf{b}} \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|B|} P(X_{\mathbf{b},1} <_{b_1} \hat{x}_{B,1}, \dots, X_{\mathbf{b},d} <_{b_d} \hat{x}_{B,d}), \end{aligned}$$

where the bracket  $\rangle$  in the  $j$ th factor is either  $\rangle$  if  $b_j = L$  or  $] \rangle$  if  $b_j = r$ , the symbol  $<_L$  denotes  $<$ , the symbol  $<_r$  denotes  $\leq$ ;  $\hat{x}_{B,j} = \alpha_j$  for  $j \in B$ , and  $\hat{x}_{B,j} = x_j$  for  $j \notin B$ .

If  $B \neq \emptyset$ , then there exists  $i \in B$ , and the corresponding summand in (19) does not depend on  $x_i$ . Consequently, this summand is a box- $(1, \dots, 1)$ -affine function. It follows, that the expression (19) is a sum of the pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(0, \dots, 0)$  and the summand corresponding to  $B = \emptyset$ , namely  $c_{\mathbf{b}} \cdot P(X_{\mathbf{b},1} <_{b_1} x_1, \dots, X_{\mathbf{b},d} <_{b_d} x_d)$ .

Finally we obtain that every box-monotone function  $f$  satisfying condition (18) (e.g. every bounded box-monotone function  $f$ ) has the following probabilistic representation

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = V(x_1, \dots, x_d) + \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} c_{\mathbf{b}} \cdot P(X_{\mathbf{b},1} <_{b_1} x_1, \dots, X_{\mathbf{b},d} <_{b_d} x_d), \quad (20)$$

where  $V$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(0, \dots, 0)$ , and for every  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$   $\mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{b}} = (X_{\mathbf{b},1}, \dots, X_{\mathbf{b},d})$  is a random vector and  $c_{\mathbf{b}} \geq 0$ . On the other hand, it can be shown that every function  $f$  of the form (20) is box-monotone and it satisfies condition (18).

## 8. INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION OF BOX- $\mathbf{N}$ -CONVEX FUNCTIONS

**Theorem 32.** Let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_d$  be open intervals (bounded or unbounded) and  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ .

Then  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, if and only if it is of the form

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, \dots, x_d) + \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d), \quad (21)$$

where  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$  and measures  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$  ( $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$ ) satisfy conditions (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 30 (here we use the standard convention that  $0^0 = 1$ ).

*Proof.* We show the implication  $(\Rightarrow)$ . Taking into account Proposition 6, it is enough to prove the implication in the case, when the function  $f$  is  $\mathbf{n}$ -regular. We use an induction on  $n_1 + \dots + n_d$ . If  $n_1 + \dots + n_d = d$ , then (21) is a consequence of Theorem 30. If  $n_1 + \dots + n_d > d$ , then  $n_i \geq 2$  for some  $i$ . By Lemma 20, we have  $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = f(x_1, \dots, \alpha_i, \dots, x_d) + \int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} \psi(x_1, \dots, t, \dots, x_d) dt$ , where  $t$  and  $\alpha_i$  stand at the  $i$ th position, and  $\psi: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $(n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ -regular and box- $(n_1, \dots, n_i - 1, \dots, n_d)$ -convex function. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) &= V(x_1, \dots, x_d) \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \frac{(x_i - u_i)^{n_i-2}}{(n_i - 2)!} \chi_{\alpha_i, x_i}^{b_i}(u_i) \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d). \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $W(x_1, \dots, x_d) = f(x_1, \dots, \alpha_i, \dots, x_d) + \int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} V(x_1, \dots, t, \dots, x_d) dt$  and observing that

$$\int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} \frac{(t - u_i)^{n_i-2}}{(n_i - 2)!} \chi_{\alpha_i, t}^{b_i}(u_i) dt = \frac{(x_i - u_i)^{n_i-1}}{(n_i - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_i, x_i}^{b_i}(u_i),$$

we obtain (21).

We pass to the proof of the implication  $(\Leftarrow)$ . We assume that the function  $f$  is of the form (21). It is enough to prove that each of the summands is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex. We will proceed by induction on  $n_1 + \dots + n_d$ . If  $n_1 + \dots + n_d = d$ , then the box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convexity of each summand is a consequence of Theorem 30. If  $n_1 + \dots + n_d > d$ , then  $n_i \geq 2$  for some  $i$ . The box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convexity of

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ &= \int_{\alpha_i}^{x_i} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \frac{(t - u_i)^{n_i-2}}{(n_i - 2)!} \chi_{\alpha_i, t}^{b_i}(u_i) \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d) dt \end{aligned}$$

is a consequence of the induction hypothesis and Lemma 21. The theorem is proved.  $\square$

The above integral representation becomes much simpler when all  $n_i$ 's are greater than 1.

**Theorem 33.** *Let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_d$  be open intervals (bounded or unbounded) and  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 2$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ .*

*Then  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, if and only if it is of the form*

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, \dots, x_d) + \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^r(u_j) d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d), \quad (22)$$

where  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$  and the measure  $\mu$  is finite on compact sets.

*Proof.* The implication  $(\Leftarrow)$  follows from Theorem 32.

We prove the implication  $(\Rightarrow)$ . By Theorem 32, the function  $f$  is of the form (21). Let  $\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d$ . Let  $\mathbf{1}_{b=L} = 1$  if  $b = L$ , and  $\mathbf{1}_{b=L} = 0$  if  $b = r$ . Since  $n_1, \dots, n_d \geq 2$ , we have

$$\frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) = \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^r(u_j) + \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_j\}}(u_j) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{b_j=L}.$$

Using the above identity we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ (23) \quad &= \sum_{B \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \hat{\chi}_{B,j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\chi}_{B,j}(u_j) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_j\}}(u_j) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{b_j=L}$  for  $j \in B$ , and  $\hat{\chi}_{B,j}(u_j) = \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^r(u_j)$  for  $j \notin B$ .

If  $B \neq \emptyset$ , then there exists  $i \in B$ , and the corresponding summand in (23) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \hat{\chi}_{B,j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d) \\ &= \frac{(x_i - \alpha_i)^{n_i-1}}{(n_i - 1)!} \cdot \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha_i\}}(u_i) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{b_i=L} \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \hat{\chi}_{B,j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d). \end{aligned}$$

Since the last integral does not depend on  $x_i$ , we obtain that the above formula represents a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ .

It follows that the expression (19) is a sum of a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$  and the summand corresponding to  $B = \emptyset$ , namely  $\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^r(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d)$ . Consequently, the function  $f$  is of the form (22), where  $\mu = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{L, r\}^d} \mu_{\mathbf{b}}$ . The theorem is proved.  $\square$

Using the same method as in the proof of Theorem 33, we can prove the following corollary.

**Corollary 34.** Let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_d$  be open intervals (bounded or unbounded) and  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Let  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . We put  $\mathbf{B} = \{(b_1, \dots, b_d) \in \{L, r\}^d : b_i = r \text{ if } n_i \geq 2, i = 1, \dots, d\}$ .

Then  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, if and only if it is of the form

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = W(x_1, \dots, x_d) + \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}} \int_{\mathbf{I}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j-1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^{b_j}(u_j) d\mu_{\mathbf{b}}(u_1, \dots, u_d), \quad (24)$$

where  $W: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1-1, \dots, n_d-1)$  and measures  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$  ( $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}$ ) satisfy conditions (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 30 (here we use the standard convention that  $0^0 = 1$ ).

**Remark 35.** The representation (24) is a counterpart of the representation (22) in the case when some (not necessarily all) of  $n_i$ 's are greater than 1. In particular, Theorem 33 is a special case of Corollary 34. It can be shown that for given  $f$  and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  the pseudo-polynomial  $W$  and the measures  $\mu_{\mathbf{b}}$  ( $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}$ ) are uniquely determined.

**Remark 36.** In the above results, we focused on the box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions, in the case when  $n_i \geq 1$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . We can also consider the case when  $n_i = 0$  for some  $i$ .

Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . Let  $A = \{i = 1, 2, \dots, d : n_i \geq 1\}$ . Then the function  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex if and only if for every  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{I}_{A'}$  the function  $f_{\mathbf{A}}^{\mathbf{z}}$  is box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convex. Since all the coordinates of  $\mathbf{n}_A$  are positive, the box- $\mathbf{n}_A$ -convexity is characterized in Corollary 34 and the preceding results.

Let  $x_+ = \max\{0, x\}$  and  $x_- = \max\{0, -x\}$ , then  $x = x_+ - x_-$  ( $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ). It is not difficult to prove the following version of Theorem 33, which is a  $d$ -dimensional counterpart of the well-known integral spline representation of  $n$ -convex functions in one dimension.

**Theorem 37.** Let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_d$  be open intervals (bounded or unbounded). Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 2$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ .

Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Then  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, if and only if for every  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ , there exist a pseudo-polynomial  $W_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$  of degree  $(n_1-1, \dots, n_d-1)$  and a Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbf{I}$ , which is finite on convex sets, such that  $f$  is of the form

$$(25) \quad f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = W_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(x_1, \dots, x_d) + \sum_{A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}} \int_{\mathbf{I}_{A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{I}_{A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}}} \prod_{j \in A'} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j-1)!} \prod_{j \in A} (-1)^{n_j} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_-^{n_j-1}}{(n_j-1)!} d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d),$$

where  $\mathbf{I}_{A, \boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \{(u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathbf{I} : u_j \leq \alpha_j \text{ if } j \in A \text{ and } u_j > \alpha_j \text{ if } j \in A'\}$ .

**Theorem 38.** Let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_d$  be open intervals (bounded or unbounded). Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  be such that  $n_i \geq 2$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ .

Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Then  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex, if and only if for all  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ , and  $\mathbf{J}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \mathbf{I} \cap \prod_{i=1}^d (\alpha_i, \infty)$ , we have

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = W_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(x_1, \dots, x_d) + \int_{\mathbf{J}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} \dots \int_{\mathbf{J}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j-1)!} d\mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(u_1, \dots, u_d),$$

for  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{J}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ , where  $W_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}: \mathbf{J}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1-1, \dots, n_d-1)$ , and  $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$  is a Borel measure on  $\mathbf{I}$ , which is finite on convex sets.

*Proof.* The implication  $(\Rightarrow)$  is an immediate consequence of Theorem 33 (we take  $W_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = W|_{\mathbf{J}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}$  and  $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \mu$ ).

We show the implication ( $\Leftarrow$ ). By Theorem 33, the function

$$g(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{(x_j - u_j)^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \chi_{\alpha_j, x_j}^r(u_j) d\mu_{\alpha}(u_1, \dots, u_d)$$

is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex on  $\mathbf{I}$ . As a consequence, it is also box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex on  $\mathbf{J}^{\alpha}$ . Consequently, the function  $f|_{\mathbf{J}^{\alpha}} = W_{\alpha} + g$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex.

Since for every  $\alpha \in \mathbf{I}$ ,  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex on  $\mathbf{J}^{\alpha}$ , we obtain that  $f$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex on  $\mathbf{I}$ .  $\square$

## 9. BOX- $\mathbf{n}$ -CONVEX ORDERS.

By the analogy to the  $n$ -convex orders and the box- $(m, n)$ -convex orders [2, 12, 19], we will define the box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex orders.

First, let us recall the definition of the  $n$ -convex order.

**Definition 7.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two random variables that take on values in the interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $X$  is said to be smaller than  $Y$  in the  $n$ -convex (respectively,  $n$ -concave) order, denoted by  $X \leq_{n\text{-cx}} Y$  ( $X \leq_{n\text{-cv}} Y$ ), if

$$\mathbb{E} f(X) \leq \mathbb{E} f(Y)$$

for all  $n$ -convex ( $n$ -concave) functions  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , for which the expectations exist.

Many properties of the  $n$ -convex order can be found in [2].

**Theorem 39.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two  $I$ -valued random variables such that  $\mathbb{E}|X|^n < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}|Y|^n < \infty$ . Then  $X \leq_{n\text{-cx}} Y$  if, and only if,

- a)  $\mathbb{E} X^k = \mathbb{E} Y^k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,
- b)  $\mathbb{E} (X - t)_+^n \leq \mathbb{E} (Y - t)_+^n$  for all  $t \in I$ .

**Theorem 40.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two  $I$ -valued random variables such that  $\mathbb{E}|X|^n < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}|Y|^n < \infty$ . Then  $X \leq_{n\text{-cx}} Y$  if, and only if,

- a)  $\mathbb{E} X^k = \mathbb{E} Y^k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,
- b')  $\mathbb{E} (-1)^{n+1} (X - t)_-^n \leq \mathbb{E} (-1)^{n+1} (Y - t)_-^n$  for all  $t \in I$ .

It is not difficult to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 41.** Let  $x, u \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $(x - u)_+^n = (x - u)^n + (-1)^{n+1} (x - u)_-^n$ .

Note, that Theorem 40 easily follows from Theorem 39 and Lemma 41.

By analogy to the  $n$ -convex order for random variables, one can define the  $n$ -convex order for the signed measures  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  on  $I$ , which have a finite variation:  $\gamma_1 \leq_{n\text{-cx}} \gamma_2$  if  $\int_I f(x) d\gamma_1(x) \leq \int_I f(x) d\gamma_2(x)$  for all for all  $n$ -convex functions  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , provided the integrals exist. Similarly one can define the  $n$ -concave order ( $\leq_{n\text{-cv}}$ ) for signed measures.

By Theorem 39 (cf [17]), it follows the following characterization of  $n$ -convex orders for the signed measures.

**Theorem 42.** Let  $\gamma$  be a signed measure on  $I$ , which has a finite variation and such that  $\int_I |x|^n d|\gamma|(x) < \infty$ . Then  $\gamma \geq_{n\text{-cx}} 0$  if, and only if,

- a)  $\int_I x^k d\gamma(x) = 0$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,
- b)  $\int_I (x - u)_+^n d\gamma(x) \geq 0$  for all  $u \in I$ .

**Remark 43.** By Theorem 40, it follows, that condition (b) in Theorem 42, can be replaced by

- b')  $\int_I (-1)^{n+1} (x - u)_-^n d\gamma(x) \geq 0$  for all  $u \in I$ .

**Remark 44.** Similarly, one can give characterizations of  $n$ -concave orders if conditions (b) and (b') (in Theorems 39, 40, 42 and Remark 43) hold with the sign reversed.

By analogy to the  $n$ -convex orders and the box- $(m, n)$ -convex orders, we define the box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex orders.

**Definition 8.** Let  $(X_1, \dots, X_d)$  and  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$  be two  $\mathbf{I}$ -valued random vectors. Then  $(X_1, \dots, X_d)$  is said to be smaller than  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$  in the box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex order, denoted by  $(X_1, \dots, X_d) \prec_{\text{box-}\mathbf{n}\text{-cx}} (Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$ , if

$$\mathbb{E} f(X_1, \dots, X_d) \leq \mathbb{E} f(Y_1, \dots, Y_d) \quad (26)$$

for all continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , provided the expectations exist.

**Theorem 45.** Let  $(X_1, \dots, X_d)$  and  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$  be two  $\mathbf{I}$ -valued random vectors such that  $\mathbb{E}|X_1|^{n_1-1} \dots |X_d|^{n_d-1} < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}|Y_1|^{n_1-1} \dots |Y_d|^{n_d-1} < \infty$ . Then

$$(X_1, \dots, X_d) \prec_{\text{box-}\mathbf{n}\text{-cx}} (Y_1, \dots, Y_d) \quad (27)$$

if, and only if, the following conditions are satisfied

a)

$$\mathbb{E} W(X_1, \dots, X_d) = \mathbb{E} W(Y_1, \dots, Y_d) \quad (28)$$

for all continuous pseudo-polynomials  $W$  of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ , provided the expectations exist,

b)

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{j \in A'} \frac{(X_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \prod_{j \in A} (-1)^{n_j} \frac{(X_j - u_j)_-^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \leq \mathbb{E} \prod_{j \in A'} \frac{(Y_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \prod_{j \in A} (-1)^{n_j} \frac{(Y_j - u_j)_-^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \quad (29)$$

for all  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $(u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ .

*Proof.* We show the implication  $(\Rightarrow)$ . Let  $W$  be a continuous pseudo-polynomial of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ . By Lemma 11,  $W$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -affine. Then taking in (26)  $f = W$  and next  $f = -W$ , we obtain (28).

Let  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  be fixed. Then there exists  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  such that  $\alpha_j < u_j$  if  $j \in A'$  and  $\alpha_j > u_j$  if  $j \in A$ , consequently  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{I}_{A, (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)}$ . Let  $f_{A, \mathbf{u}}: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function given by the formula

$$f_{A, \mathbf{u}}(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \prod_{j \in A'} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \prod_{j \in A} (-1)^{n_j} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_-^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!}$$

Then, by Theorem 37, the function  $f_{A, \mathbf{u}}$  is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex and it is of the form (25) with  $W_\alpha = 0$  and  $\mu = \delta_{(u_1, \dots, u_d)}$ . Then by (26), taking  $f = f_{A, \mathbf{u}}$ , we obtain (29).

We pass to the proof of the implication  $(\Leftarrow)$ . Let  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex function. Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ . Then, by Theorem 37, the function  $f$  is of the form (25). Then

$$(30) \quad \mathbb{E} f(X_1, \dots, X_d) = \mathbb{E} W_\alpha(X_1, \dots, X_d) + \sum_{A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}} \int_{\mathbf{I}_{A, \alpha}} \dots \int \mathbb{E} \prod_{j \in A'} \frac{(X_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \prod_{j \in A} (-1)^{n_j} \frac{(X_j - u_j)_-^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} d\mu(u_1, \dots, u_d).$$

Inequality (26) now follows from (28), (29), using identity (30), and a similar identity involving  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$ . Thus inequality (27) is satisfied.  $\square$

By analogy to box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex orders for random vectors, we define the box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex order for signed measures  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  on  $\mathbf{I}$ , which have a finite variation:  $\gamma_1 \prec_{\text{box-}\mathbf{n}\text{-cx}} \gamma_2$  if

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} f(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\gamma_1(x_1, \dots, x_d) \leq \int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} f(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\gamma_2(x_1, \dots, x_d)$$

for all continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , provided the integrals exist. From Theorem 45, it follows the following characterization of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex order for signed measures.

**Theorem 46.** *Let  $\gamma$  be a signed measure on  $\mathbf{I}$  which has a finite variation and such that  $\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} |x_1|^{n_1-1}, \dots, |x_d|^{n_d-1} d|\gamma|(x_1, \dots, x_d) < \infty$ . Then*

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} f(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\gamma(x_1, \dots, x_d) \geq 0$$

for all continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  if, and only if,

a)

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} W(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\gamma(x_1, \dots, x_d) = 0 \quad (31)$$

for all continuous pseudo-polynomials  $W$  of order  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$ , provided the integral exists,

b)

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} \prod_{j \in A'} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} \prod_{j \in A} (-1)^{n_j} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_-^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} d\gamma(x_1, \dots, x_d) \geq 0 \quad (32)$$

for all  $A \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  and  $(u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ .

By Theorem 46, we obtain the following characterization of box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex order for the signed measure  $\gamma = \gamma_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \gamma_d$ , which is a product measure of  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ .

**Theorem 47.** *Let  $\gamma_i$  be non zero signed finite Borel measures on  $I_i$ , such that  $\int_{I_i} |x_i|^{n_i-1} d|\gamma_i|(x_i) < \infty$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then*

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} f(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\gamma_1(x_1) \dots d\gamma_d(x_d) \geq 0 \quad (33)$$

for all continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (provided the integral exists) if, and only if ,

- a) for all  $j = 1, \dots, d$  either  $\gamma_j \geq_{(n_j-1)\text{-cx}} \mathbf{0}$  or  $\gamma_j \geq_{(n_j-1)\text{-cv}} \mathbf{0}$ ,
- b) the number of those  $j$  for which  $\gamma_j \geq_{(n_j-1)\text{-cv}} \mathbf{0}$  is even.

*Proof.* We show the implication  $(\Rightarrow)$ . By Theorem 46 (a)

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \cdots \int_{\mathbf{I}} W(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\tau_1(x_1) \dots d\tau_d(x_d) = 0$$

for all continuous pseudo-polynomials of degree  $(n_1 - 1, \dots, n_d - 1)$  of the form

$$W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=0}^{n_i-1} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) x_i^k, \quad (34)$$

provided the integral exists. Then, for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $k = 0, \dots, n_i - 1$

$$\int_{I_i} x_i^k d\gamma_i(x_i) \int_{I_1 \times \dots \times I_{i-1} \times I_{i+1} \times \dots \times I_d} A_{ik}(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}'}) d\gamma_1(x_1) \dots d\gamma_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) d\gamma_{i+1}(x_{i+1}) \dots d\gamma_d(x_d) = 0. \quad (35)$$

Since  $\gamma_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$  are non-zero signed measures, it follows that there exists the functions  $A_{ik}$ , such that the second integral in the above expression is non-zero. Then by (35), we obtain

$$\int_{I_i} x_i^k d\gamma_i(x_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, d, k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i - 1. \quad (36)$$

By (32), for  $A = \emptyset$ , we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^d \int_{I_j} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} d\gamma_j(x_j) \geq 0 \quad (37)$$

for all  $(u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ . We denote

$$H(\gamma_j, u_j) = \int_{I_j} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} d\gamma_j(x_j).$$

Since  $\gamma_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are non-zero signed measures, it follows that there exist  $(v_1, \dots, v_d) \in \mathbf{I}$  such that  $H(\gamma_i, v_i) \neq 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

Let  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . By (37),  $H(\gamma_i, u_i) \prod_{j \neq i} H(\gamma_j, v_j) \geq 0$  for each  $u_i \in I_i$ . Consequently, either  $H(\gamma_i, u_i) \geq 0$  for all  $u_i \in I_i$  or  $H(\gamma_i, u_i) \leq 0$  for all  $u_i \in I_i$ .

Moreover, by (37), we conclude, that the number of  $j$ 's such that  $H(\gamma_j, u_j) \leq 0$  for all  $u_j \in I_j$ , is even. Taking into account (36), by Theorem 42 and Remark 44, ( $\Rightarrow$ ) is proved.

We pass to the proof of the implication ( $\Leftarrow$ ). Assume, that conditions a) and b) are satisfied. By Theorem 42, we have that (36) is satisfied, then taking into account (35), (34), we obtain (31) with  $\gamma = \gamma_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \gamma_d$ .

By Theorem 42 and Remark 44 we have that for all  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , either  $H(\gamma_j, u_j) \geq 0$  for all  $u_j \in I_j$  or  $H(\gamma_j, u_j) \leq 0$  for all  $u_j \in I_j$ , and the number of those  $j$  for which  $H(\gamma_j, u_j) \leq 0$  for all  $u_j \in I_j$ , is even.

By Remark 43, we conclude that the function  $H(\gamma_j, u_j)$  has the same sign as the function

$$S(\gamma_j, u_j) = \int_{I_j} (-1)^{n_j-1} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} d\gamma_j(x_j).$$

This implies that for each  $A \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $(u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ , we have

$$\prod_{j \in A'} H(\gamma_j, u_j) \prod_{j \in A} S(\gamma_j, u_j) \geq 0.$$

Consequently, (32) is satisfied for  $\gamma = \gamma_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \gamma_d$ . By Theorem 46, this completes the proof of ( $\Leftarrow$ ).  $\square$

By Theorem 42 and Remark 43, we obtain that Theorem 47 can be rewritten in the following form.

**Theorem 48.** *Let  $\gamma_i$  be non zero signed finite Borel measures on  $I_i$ , such that  $\int_{I_i} |x_i|^{n_i-1} d|\gamma_i|(x_i) < \infty$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then*

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \dots \int f(x_1, \dots, x_d) d\gamma_1(x_1) \dots d\gamma_d(x_d) \geq 0$$

for all continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (provided the integral exists) if, and only if,

a)

$$\int_{I_i} x_i^k d\gamma_i(x_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i - 1. \quad (38)$$

b)

$$\prod_{j=1}^d \int_{I_j} \frac{(x_j - u_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j - 1)!} d\gamma_j(x_j) \geq 0$$

for all  $(u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ .

From Theorem 47, it follows immediately the following theorem.

**Theorem 49.** *Let  $\mu_i, \nu_i$  be probability measures on  $I_i$  such that  $\int_{I_i} |x_i|^{n_i-1} d\mu_i(x_i) < \infty$ ,  $\int_{I_i} |x_i|^{n_i-1} d\nu_i(x_i) < \infty$  and  $\nu_i \leq_{(n_j-1)\text{-cx}} \mu_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then*

$$\int_{\mathbf{I}} \dots \int f(x_1, \dots, x_d) d(\mu_1 - \nu_1)(x_1) \dots d(\mu_d - \nu_d)(x_d) \geq 0$$

for all continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (provided the integral exists).

### 10. THE HERMITE-HADAMARD, JENSEN AND RAŞA INEQUALITIES

We recall the classical Hermite-Hadamard and Jensen inequalities.

**Proposition 7.** *Let  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function defined on a real interval  $I$  and  $a, b \in I$  with  $a < b$ . The following double inequality*

$$f\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{b-a} \cdot \int_a^b f(x) dx \leq \frac{f(a)+f(b)}{2}$$

is known as the Hermite-Hadamard inequality for convex functions (see [3]), which is equivalent to the convex ordering relations (see [16])

$$\delta_{(a+b)/2} \leq_{1-cx} \frac{1}{b-a} \chi_{[a,b]}(x) dx \leq_{1-cx} \frac{1}{2}(\delta_a + \delta_b).$$

**Proposition 8.** *One of the most familiar and elementary inequalities in the probability theory is the Jensen inequality:*

$$f(\mathbb{E} X) \leq \mathbb{E} f(X), \quad (39)$$

where the function  $f$  is convex over the convex hull of the range of the random variable  $X$  (see [1]). Inequality (39) is equivalent to the convex ordering relation (see [16])

$$\delta_{\mathbb{E} X} \leq_{1-cx} \mu_X.$$

In this paper, we give some Hermite-Hadamard, Jensen and Raşa inequalities for box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions.

Note that Theorem 49 is equivalent to the following theorem.

**Theorem 50.** *Let  $X_i, Y_i$  be  $I_i$  valued random variables such that  $\mathbb{E}|X_i|^{n_i-1} < \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{E}|Y_i|^{n_i-1} < \infty$  and  $X_i \leq_{(n_i-1)-cx} Y_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . For each  $A \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ , by  $Z_{1,A}, \dots, Z_{d,A}$  we denote independent random variables such that*

$$\mu_{Z_{i,A}} = \begin{cases} \mu_{Y_i} & \text{if } i \notin A, \\ \mu_{X_i} & \text{if } i \in A. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Then

$$\sum_{A \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|A|} \mathbb{E} f(Z_{1,A}, \dots, Z_{d,A}) \geq 0, \quad (41)$$

for all continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (provided the expectations exist).

From Proposition 7 and Theorem 50, we obtain the following Hermite-Hadamard type inequalities for box- $(2, \dots, 2)$ -convex functions.

**Theorem 51.** *Let  $a_i, b_i \in I_i$  with  $a_i < b_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then, for all continuous box- $(2, \dots, 2)$ -convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,*

(a) *the first Hermite-Hadamard inequality is given by (41), with*

$$\mu_{X_i} = \delta_{(a_i+b_i)/2} \quad \mu_{Y_i} = \frac{1}{b_i - a_i} \chi_{[a_i, b_i]}(x) dx, \quad (i = 1, \dots, d),$$

(b) *the second Hermite-Hadamard inequality is given by (41), with*

$$\mu_{X_i} = \frac{1}{b_i - a_i} \chi_{[a_i, b_i]}(x) dx, \quad \mu_{Y_i} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{a_i} + \delta_{b_i}) \quad (i = 1, \dots, d).$$

For  $d = 3$ , we obtain the following first Hermite-Hadamard inequality.

**Theorem 52.** Let  $a_i, b_i \in I_i$  with  $a_i < b_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Then, for all continuous box-(2, 2, 2)-convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have

*the first Hermite-Hadamard inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(b_1 - a_1)(b_2 - a_2)(b_3 - a_3)} \int_{a_1}^{b_1} \int_{a_2}^{b_2} \int_{a_3}^{b_3} f(x, y, z) dz dy dx - \frac{1}{(b_2 - a_2)(b_3 - a_3)} \int_{a_2}^{b_2} \int_{a_3}^{b_3} f\left(\frac{a_1 + b_1}{2}, y, z\right) dz dy \\ & - \frac{1}{(b_1 - a_1)(b_3 - a_3)} \int_{a_1}^{b_1} \int_{a_3}^{b_3} f\left(x, \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2}, z\right) dz dx - \frac{1}{(b_1 - a_1)(b_2 - a_2)} \int_{a_1}^{b_1} \int_{a_2}^{b_2} f\left(x, y, \frac{a_3 + b_3}{2}\right) dy dx \\ & + \frac{1}{(b_1 - a_1)} \int_{a_1}^{b_1} f\left(x, \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2}, \frac{a_3 + b_3}{2}\right) dx + \frac{1}{(b_2 - a_2)} \int_{a_2}^{b_2} f\left(\frac{a_1 + b_1}{2}, y, \frac{a_3 + b_3}{2}\right) dy \\ & + \frac{1}{(b_3 - a_3)} \int_{a_3}^{b_3} f\left(\frac{a_1 + b_1}{2}, \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2}, z\right) dz - f\left(\frac{a_1 + b_1}{2}, \frac{a_2 + b_2}{2}, \frac{a_3 + b_3}{2}\right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 7 and Theorem 50, we obtain the following Jensen type inequalities for box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions.

**Theorem 53.** Let  $X_i$  be  $I_i$  valued random variables,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then, for all continuous box-(2, ..., 2)-convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have *the Jensen inequality*

$$\sum_{A \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} (-1)^{|A|} \mathbb{E} f(Z_{1,A}, \dots, Z_{d,A}) \geq 0,$$

where  $Z_{1,A}, \dots, Z_{d,A}$  are independent random variables such that

$$\mu_{Z_{i,A}} = \begin{cases} \mu_{X_i} & \text{if } i \notin A, \\ \delta_{\mathbb{E} X_i} & \text{if } i \in A. \end{cases}$$

For  $d = 3$ , we obtain the following Jensen inequality.

**Theorem 54.** Let  $X, Y, Z$  be  $I_1, I_2, I_3$  valued random variables, respectively. Then, for all continuous box-(2, 2, 2)-convex functions  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have *the Jensen inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} f(X, Y, Z) - \mathbb{E} f(\mathbb{E} X, Y, Z) - \mathbb{E} f(X, \mathbb{E} Y, Z) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y, \mathbb{E} Z) \\ & + \mathbb{E} f(X, \mathbb{E} Y, \mathbb{E} Z) + \mathbb{E} f(\mathbb{E} X, Y, \mathbb{E} Z) + \mathbb{E} f(\mathbb{E} X, \mathbb{E} Y, Z) - f(\mathbb{E} X, \mathbb{E} Y, \mathbb{E} Z) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

If the random variables have discrete distributions, then the above Jensen inequality has the following form.

**Theorem 55.** Let  $I_1, I_2, I_3$  be real intervals. Let  $M, N, L > 1$ .  $x_1, \dots, x_M \in I_1$ ,  $y_1, \dots, y_N \in I_2$ ,  $z_1, \dots, z_L \in I_3$ ,  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_N, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_L \geq 0$ ,  $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_M = \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_N = \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_L = 1$ ,  $\bar{x} = \alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_M x_M$ ,  $\bar{y} = \beta_1 y_1 + \dots + \beta_N y_N$ ,  $\bar{z} = \gamma_1 z_1 + \dots + \gamma_L z_L$ . Then for all continuous box-(2, 2, 2)-convex functions

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^L \alpha_i \beta_j \gamma_k f(x_i, y_j, z_k) - \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^L \beta_j \gamma_k f(\bar{x}, y_j, z_k) - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^L \alpha_i \gamma_k f(x_i, \bar{y}, z_k) - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_i \beta_j f(x_i, y_j, \bar{z}) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^M \alpha_i f(x_i, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) + \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j f(\bar{x}, y_j, \bar{z}) + \sum_{k=1}^L \gamma_k f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, z_k) - f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall the Raşa inequality. Its probabilistic version has the following form (see [18], [13])

$$(\nu - \mu)^{*2} \geq_{1-cx} 0,$$

where  $\mu = B(n, x)$  and  $\nu = B(n, y)$  are the binomial distributions with parameters  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ . By  $(\nu - \mu)^{*2}$  we mean  $(\nu - \mu) * (\nu - \mu)$ , where  $*$  is the convolution of signed measures. In [9, 10, 11], we obtained some useful necessary and sufficient conditions for Borel measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  to satisfy the following generalized Raşa inequality, involving  $q$ -th convolutional power of the signed measure  $\nu - \mu$ :

$$(\nu - \mu)^{*q} \geq_{(q-1)-cx} 0, \quad q \geq 2.$$

In [12], we investigated the generalized Raşa inequality for box- $(m, n)$ -convex functions. In this paper, we study the generalized Raşa inequality for box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions. We will need two lemmas.

**Lemma 56** ([11], Lemma 5, p.5). *Let  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$  be signed measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  with finite variation, such that  $\tau_i(\mathbb{R}) = 0$  and  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x|^{n-1} |\tau_i|(dx) < \infty$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , Then*

$$(a) \quad \tau_1 * \dots * \tau_n(\mathbb{R}) = 0,$$

$$(b) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^k \tau_1 * \dots * \tau_n(dx) = 0 \text{ for all integers } 0 < k < n.$$

**Lemma 57** ([11], p.7). *Let  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_q$  be signed measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  with finite variation, such that  $\tau_i(\mathbb{R}) = 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, q$ . Then for all  $A \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(x - A)_+^{q-1}}{(q-1)!} \tau_1 * \dots * \tau_q(dx) = \overline{F}_{\tau_1} * \overline{F}_{\tau_2} * \dots * \overline{F}_{\tau_q}(A),$$

where  $\overline{F}_{\tau_i}(x) = \tau_i([x, \infty))$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, q$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . On the right side of the above equality, the symbol  $*$  denotes the convolution of functions on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 58.** *Let  $\mathbf{n} = n_1, \dots, n_d$ ,  $n_i \geq 2$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Let  $\mu_i, \nu_i$ , be probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ , such that  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x|^{n_i-1} \mu_i(dx) < \infty$ ,  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x|^{n_i-1} \nu_i(dx) < \infty$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

a) *the Raşa inequality for continuous box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions*

$$(\nu_1 - \mu_1)^{*n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes (\nu_d - \mu_d)^{*n_d} \succ_{box-\mathbf{n}-cx} 0,$$

b)

$$(\overline{F}_{\nu_1} - \overline{F}_{\mu_1})^{*n_1}(A_1) \times \dots \times (\overline{F}_{\nu_m} - \overline{F}_{\mu_m})^{*n_d}(A_d) \geq 0$$

for all  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\tau_i = \nu_i - \mu_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then  $\tau_i$  are signed measure such that  $\tau_i(\mathbb{R}) = 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , thus by Lemma 56, it follows that for  $\gamma_i = \tau_i^{*n_i}$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_i^k \gamma_i(dx_i) = 0, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n_i - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then, by Theorem 48, we conclude that condition a) is equivalent to

$$\prod_{j=1}^d \int_{I_j} \frac{(x_j - A_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j-1)!} d\gamma_j(x_j) \geq 0$$

for all  $(A_1, \dots, A_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ . Taking into account, that by Lemma 57,

$$\int_{I_j} \frac{(x_j - A_j)_+^{n_j-1}}{(n_j-1)!} d\gamma_j(x_j) = (\overline{F}_{\tau_j})^{*n_j}(A_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

the theorem is proved.  $\square$

Similarly to [12], we define strongly box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions.

**Definition 9.** We say that a function  $f: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is strongly box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions with modulus  $C \geq 0$ , if the function  $g: \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by the formula  $g(x_1, \dots, x_d) = f(x_1, \dots, x_d) - Cx_1^{n_1} \dots x_d^{n_d}$  ( $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{I}$ ) is box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex.

Then, using the methods presented above and in [12], one can prove other the Raşa, Jensen and Hermite-Hadamard inequalities for box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions as well as for strongly box- $\mathbf{n}$ -convex functions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Billingsley P.: Probability and Measure, John Wiley & Sons, New York, (1995).
- [2] Denuit M., Lefevre C., Shaked M.: The s-convex orders among real random variables, with applications. *Math. Inequal. Appl.*, **1**(1), 585–613, (1998).
- [3] Dragomir S. S., Pearce C. E. M.: Selected Topics on Hermite-Hadamard Inequalities and Applications, RGMIA Monographs, Victoria University, (2000). (Online: <http://rgmia.vu.edu.au/monographs/>).
- [4] Gal, S. G., Niculescu, C. P.: A new look at Popoviciu’s concept for functions of two variables. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **479**, 903–925 (2019).
- [5] Gavrea, B.: On a convexity problem in connection with some linear operators. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **461**, 319–332 (2018).
- [6] Gavrea, B., Gavrea, I.: An Inequality Involving Some Linear Positive Operators and Box-Convex Functions. *Results Math.* **77**(1), 33–43, (2022).
- [7] Gavrea, B., Gavrea, I.: An Inequality Involving Bernstein Polynomials and Box- Convex Functions. *Mediterr. J. Math.* **19**, 18–33 (2022).
- [8] Hopf, E.: Uber die Zusammenhänge zwischen gewissen höheren Differenzen-quotienten reellen Funktionen einer reellen Variablen und deren Differenzierbarkeitseigenschaften. Thesis Univ. of Berlin, Berlin, (1926).
- [9] Komisarski, A., Rajba, T.: Muirhead inequality for convex orders and a problem of I. Raşa on Bernstein polynomials. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **458**, 821–830 (2018).
- [10] Komisarski A., Rajba T.: On the Raşa inequality for higher order convex functions. *Results Math.* **76**(2), 103–115 (2021).
- [11] Komisarski A., Rajba T.: On the Raşa inequality for higher order convex functions II. *Results Math.* **77**(2), 88–100 (2022).
- [12] Komisarski A., Rajba T.: On the integral representation and the Raşa, Jensen and Hermite-Hadamard inequalities for box-convex functions. *Results Math.* **78**(3), 89–119 (2023).
- [13] Mrowiec J., Rajba T., Wąsowicz S.: A solution to the problem of Raşa connected with Bernstein polynomials. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **446**, 864–878 (2017).
- [14] Popoviciu T.: Sur quelques proprietés des fonctions d’une ou de deux variables reelles. *Mathematica.* **8**, 1–85 (1934).
- [15] Popoviciu T.: Les Fonctions Convexes. Hermann. Paris. (1944).
- [16] Rajba T.: On the Ohlin lemma for Hermite-Hadamard-Fejér type inequalities. *Math. Inequal. Appl.*, **17**(2), 557–571 (2014).
- [17] Rajba T.: On a generalization of a theorem of Levin and Stečkin and inequalities of the Hermite–Hadamard type. *Math. Inequal. Appl.*, **20**(2), 363–375 (2017).
- [18] Raşa, I.: 2. Problem, p. 164. In: Report of Meeting Conference on Ulam’s Type Stability, Rytro, Poland, June 2–6, 2014, *Ann. Univ. Paedagog. Crac. Stud. Math.* **13**, 139–169 (2014). DOI: 10.2478/aupcsm-2014-0011.
- [19] Shaked M., Shanthikumar J.G.: Stochastic Orders. Springer. (2007).

(Andrzej Komisarski) FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF LODZ, BANACHA 22, 90–238 ŁÓDŹ, POLAND

*Email address:* [andkom@math.uni.lodz.pl](mailto:andkom@math.uni.lodz.pl)

(Teresa Rajba) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BIELSKO-BIALA, UL. WILLOWA 2, 43-309 BIELSKO-BIALA, POLAND

*Email address:* [trajba@ubb.edu.pl](mailto:trajba@ubb.edu.pl)