

SOME NEW MINIMAX THEOREMS

MOHAMMED BACHIR

ABSTRACT. We establish an alternative theorem and deduce some new minimax theorems extending classical results such as Fan, König and Simons theorems. Some applications will be given.

Keywords: Minimax theorem, Alternative theorem, convexlikeness, function spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X and Y be arbitrary nonempty sets and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Recall that, f is said to be t -convexlike on X for some $t \in (0, 1)$, if and only if for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, there exists $x_3 \in X$ such that $f(x_3, y) \leq tf(x_1, y) + (1 - t)f(x_2, y)$, for all $y \in Y$ and f is said to be t -concavelike on Y , if and only if for all $y_1, y_2 \in Y$, there exists $y_3 \in Y$ such that $f(x, y_3) \geq tf(x, y_1) + (1 - t)f(x, y_2)$, for all $x \in X$. We say that f is convexlike on X , a concept due to Fan, (resp. concavelike on Y) if and only if f is t -convexlike on X (resp. f is t -concavelike on Y) for every $t \in (0, 1)$. Clearly, a convex (resp. concave) function on a convex set is convexlike (resp. concavelike) but the converse is not true in general. The more general notions of infsup-convexity and supinf-concavity will be given in Definition 1 and Proposition 1. Several properties of these concepts and their uses can be found in [23, 25, 18, 8, 9, 10]. We say that f has a property (P) on X (resp. on Y) if the function $f(\cdot, y)$ (resp. $f(x, \cdot)$) has the property (P) for every $y \in Y$ (resp. for every $x \in X$). In general, the properties that concern us in this paper will be (P) = "boundedness", "semicontinuity", "convexity" or "generalized convexity".

The Fan minimax theorem in [12, Theorem 2] (see also [23, Theorem 11]) says that if Y is an arbitrary nonempty sets, X is a compact Hausdorff space and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function, lower semicontinuous convexlike on X and concavelike on Y , then

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \sup_{x \in Y} \inf_{y \in X} f(x, y). \quad (\bullet)$$

The Fan minimax theorem was extended by Simons in [22, Theorem 5c] (see also [23, Theorem 26]) to two-functions minimax inequality as follows. Let Y be an arbitrary nonempty sets, X is a compact Hausdorff space, $t \in (0, 1)$ and $f, g : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two functions such that:

- (i) f is t -convexlike and lower semicontinuous on X ,
- (ii) g is t -concavelike on Y ,
- (iii) $f \leq g$.

Date: June 25, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 46E15, 46E10, 26B25, Secondary 26D99.

Then,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} g(x, y).$$

The aim of this article is to establish new two-functions minimax inequality extending classical results such as Fan, König and Simons theorems. Our results will be proved in a non-compact setting. We also prove, under very general conditions, that the one-function minimax equality is in fact equivalent to Simons' inequality. Some applications will be given. Our results will be derived from a new version of the alternative theorem (Theorem 1).

A. Minimax theorem with Simons inequality. In a first result (Theorem 2), we will replace the compactness of X and the semicontinuity of f on X by the following more general condition (in arbitrary nonempty sets X and Y), which we will call the *Simons inequality*: for every net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I} \subset X$,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y). \quad (\bullet\bullet)$$

This inequality is clearly satisfied when X is Hausdorff compact set and f lower semicontinuous on X . We will show (Theorem 3) that the Simons inequality in $(\bullet\bullet)$ is in fact a necessary and sufficient condition for obtaining the one-function minimax equality in (\bullet) , whenever f is assumed to be bounded t -convexlike on X and s -concavelike on Y for some $t, s \in (0, 1)$. We give in Example 3 a general framework where the Simons' inequality holds without compactness, thus ensuring a non-compact minimax theorem.

The Simons inequality has been studied for the first time by Simons in [24] under certain conditions and extended by Deville and Finet in [7] and Kivisoo and Oja in [16]. Note here that the authors just cited have considered this inequality with sequences $(x_n)_n$ instead of nets $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ (see Remark 1). By combining our result in Theorem 2 together with the main result in [16] about the Simons' inequality, we give in Corollary 2 a new minimax inequality without the compactness or semicontinuity assumptions but assuming only convexity on one variable.

B. Minimax theorem in the pseudocompact framework. The second part of the paper deals with the two-functions minimax inequality in the context of completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact spaces. Recall that a topological space is said to be pseudocompact if its image under any real-valued continuous function is bounded. Every countably compact space is pseudocompact. For various properties on pseudocompact spaces we refer to the article by Stephenson in [26].

Let X be an arbitrary nonempty set, Y be a completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact space and $f, g : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two function such that:

(i) f is bounded on $X \times Y$, infsup-convex on X and the family $\{f(x, \cdot) : x \in X\}$ is equicontinuous on Y ,

(ii) g is supinf-concave on Y and bounded on X ,

(iii) $f \leq g$.

Then, it is shown in theorem 4 that the two-functions minimax inequality holds: $\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} g(x, y)$.

To the best of our knowledge, this situation (in the pseudocompact framework) is also new in the literature. Moreover, the notion of infsup-convexity is weaker than convexity, convexlikeness, t -convexlikeness etc. As a consequence, we prove (Corollary 3) that if Z is a Hausdorff countably compact space, E is a Banach

space and $(f_n)_n$ is a uniformly bounded sequence of continuous functions from Z into E which w^* -pointwise converges to 0 on Z , then there exists a sequence of linear convex combinations of (f_n) which is uniformly convergent to 0 on Z (an extension of a known result in [7, Proposition]).

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we recall the definitions of infsup-convexity and supinf-concavity and we prove that these concepts generalise those of t -convexlikness and t -concavelikness. In Section 3 we prove a new alternative theorem (Theorem 1) and give four lemmas. These results are the main tools in the article. They will be used to prove our results on minimax theorems. In Section 4, we prove our main results Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 and we give some consequences. In Section 5, we give an application to w^* -pointwise convergent sequence of vector-valued functions.

2. INFSUP-CONVEXITY AND SUPINF-CONCAVITY

The concept of the infsup-convexity is a well-known generalization of convexity, convexlikness and t -convexlikness ($t \in (0, 1)$) used by several authors. It was considered for the first time by Stefanescu in [25, Definition 2.11] as affine weakly convexlikness, the present nomenclature is due to Galán and was given in [9, Definition 2.1] (see also [8, 10]). For $n \geq 2$, the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional simplex is defined by

$$\Delta_n := \{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1\}.$$

Definition 1. Let X and Y be nonempty sets and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function.

(i) We say that f is infsup-convex on X if and only if,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) &= \inf_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Delta_n}} \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f(x_i, y) \\ &:= \inf_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_X)} \sup_{y \in Y} \Psi(y) \end{aligned}$$

where $C_X := \{f(x, \cdot) : x \in X\}$.

(ii) We say that f is supinf-concave on Y if and only if,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) &= \sup_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ y_1, \dots, y_n \in Y \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Delta_n}} \inf_{x \in X} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f(x, y_i) \\ &:= \sup_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Psi(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_Y := \{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\}$

We easily see from the definitions that:

$$f \text{ is convexlike on } X \implies f \text{ is infsup-convex on } X.$$

The converse is not true in general (see for instance [25, Example 2.15] see also [10]). However, the notion of infsup-convexity (resp. supinf-concavity) is also a generalisation of t -convexity (resp. t -concavity) with an arbitrarily fixed $t \in (0, 1)$. This follows from a density argument by using the following known fact:

Fact 1. (see [18] and [25, Remark 2.8]) If f is t -convexlike on X for some $t \in (0, 1)$, then for any integer $n \geq 2$, there exists a dense subset $D_n(t)$ of Δ_n such that: $\forall x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in X, \forall (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in D_n(t), \exists x_0 \in X$ such that,

$$f(x_0, \cdot) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i f(x_i, \cdot), \text{ on } Y. \quad (1)$$

Proposition 1. Let X and Y be nonempty sets and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function.

(i) Suppose that f is t -convexlike on X for some $t \in (0, 1)$, bounded on Y and such that $\sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) > -\infty$. Then, f is *infsup-convex* on X .

(ii) Suppose that f is s -concavelike on Y for some $s \in (0, 1)$, bounded on X and such that $\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) < +\infty$. Then, f is *supinf-concave* on Y .

Proof. We will only give the proof of (i), the part (ii) can be obtained in a similar way. Using Fact 1 in (1), we get

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \inf_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \\ (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in D_n(t)}} \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i f(x_i, y). \quad (2)$$

We want to establish the same inequality with Δ_n instead of $D_n(t)$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \geq 2, (\bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_N) \in \Delta_N$ and $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_N \in X$ such that

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\lambda}_i f(\bar{x}_i, y) - \varepsilon < R := \inf_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Delta_n}} \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f(x_i, y). \quad (3)$$

Notice that $R \geq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) > -\infty$. By the boundedness of f on Y , let us choose $\beta > 0$ small enough such that

$$\beta \sum_{i=1}^N \sup_{y \in Y} |f(\bar{x}_i, y)| \leq 1,$$

By the density of the set $D_N(t)$ in Δ_N , there exists $(\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_N) \in D_N(t)$ such that $\max\{|\bar{\lambda}_i - \bar{a}_i| : i = 1, \dots, N\} < \varepsilon\beta$. Then, for every $y \in Y$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N (\bar{a}_i - \bar{\lambda}_i) f(\bar{x}_i, y) \right| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N |\bar{a}_i - \bar{\lambda}_i| |f(\bar{x}_i, y)| \\ &\leq \varepsilon\beta \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^N |f(\bar{x}_i, y)| \\ &\leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{a}_i f(\bar{x}_i, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\lambda}_i f(\bar{x}_i, y) + \varepsilon.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \\ (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{D}_n(t)}} \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i f(x_i, y) &\leq \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{a}_i f(\bar{x}_i, y) \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\lambda}_i f(\bar{x}_i, y) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2) and (3) that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \inf_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Delta_n}} \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f(x_i, y) + 2\varepsilon.$$

Sending ε to zero, we get

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \inf_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ x_1, \dots, x_n \in X \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Delta_n}} \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f(x_i, y).$$

The inverse inequality is always true. Hence, (i) is proved. \square

3. AN ALTERNATIVE THEOREM AND MAIN LEMMAS

There is a wealth of literature on the subjects of alternatives theorems. Some work on the alternatives in convex and non-convex frameworks and their applications to optimization theory can be found in [5, 6, 14, 15, 17], but the list is not exhaustive. We can also find some recent work using the so called inf-sup-convexity in [8, 9, 10] and the references therein. The earliest version of a nonlinear alternative theorem was given by Fan, Glicksberg, and Hoffman [13] as follows: Let C be a convex set of some real vector space and $f_i; C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ be convex functions. Then, either the system $x \in C$, $f_i(x) < 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ has a solution or there exists $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\lambda^* \neq 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^* f_i(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in C$.

We give in the following theorem a new version of the alternative theorem which deals with an arbitrary family of functions. This result will be very useful for the rest of our work. Let's start by recalling some well-known general facts. Given a topological space (Z, τ) , the space $(\mathcal{C}_b(Z), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ denotes the classical Banach space of all real-valued bounded continuous functions on Z . The continuous Dirac map is defined by $\delta : Z \rightarrow \delta(Z) \subset B_{(C_b(Z))^*}$, $z \mapsto \delta_z$, where $B_{(C_b(Z))^*}$ is the closed unit ball of the dual space $(C_b(Z))^*$ and $\delta_z : C_b(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the linear continuous map defined by $\delta_z(\varphi) = \varphi(z)$ for all $z \in Z$ and all $\varphi \in C_b(Z)$. Notice that $\|\delta_z\| \leq 1$, for all $z \in Z$. We denote by $\text{conv}(\delta(Z)) := \text{conv}\{\delta_z : z \in Z\}$ and $\overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(Z)) := \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}\{\delta_z : z \in Z\}$ the convex hull and the w^* -closed convex hull of $\delta(Z)$ respectively. By τ_p we denote the topology in $C_b(Z)$ of pointwise convergence on Z . If Z is an arbitrary non-empty set, we equip it with the discrete distance, so that $C_b(Z)$ coincides with $\ell^\infty(Z)$ the space of all real-valued bounded functions.

Theorem 1. *Let X be a topological space and A be a nonempty convex subset of $C_b(X)$. Then, either A_1) or A_2) is true, where:*

$$A_1) \text{ there exists } \Phi_0 \in A \text{ such that } \sup_{x \in X} \Phi_0(x) < 0,$$

A_2) there exists $\nu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w*} \{\delta_x : x \in X\}$ such that $\langle \nu, \Phi \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\Phi \in A$.

If moreover, we assume that X is completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact space and A is uniformly bounded and relatively compact for the topology τ_p of pointwise convergence on X , then we obtain in A_2) that $\langle \nu, \Phi \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\Phi \in \overline{A}^{\tau_p}$.

Proof. It is easy to see that for all $\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w*} \{\delta_x : x \in X\}$ and all $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_b(X)$, we have $\langle \mu, \Phi \rangle \leq \sup_{x \in X} \Phi(x)$. So it is clear that A_1) and A_2) cannot be realised at the same time. However, we will show that one of the alternatives A_1) or A_2), is always realised. Indeed, this follows from the following alternatives respectively: either $-\mathbf{1}_X \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^+ A + \mathcal{C}_b^+(X)}$ or $-\mathbf{1}_X \notin \overline{\mathbb{R}^+ A + \mathcal{C}_b^+(X)}$, where $\mathcal{C}_b^+(X)$ denotes the closed convex positive cone of $\mathcal{C}_b(X)$, the function $\mathbf{1}_X$ denotes the constant function equal to 1 on X and the closure is taken in the Banach space $(\mathcal{C}_b(X), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$.

Case 1. Suppose that $-\mathbf{1}_X \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^+ A + \mathcal{C}_b^+(X)}$. In this case, there are some $\lambda \geq 0$, $\Phi_0 \in A$ and $h_0 \in \mathcal{C}_b^+(X)$ such that

$$\|h_0 + \lambda\Phi_0 + \mathbf{1}_X\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2}$$

It follows that, for all $x \in X$,

$$h_0(x) + \lambda\Phi_0(x) + 1 < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Notice from the above inequality and the positivity of h_0 that necessarily we have $\lambda > 0$ and so we have $\Phi_0(x) < -\frac{1}{2\lambda}$, for all $x \in X$. We deduce that $\sup_{x \in X} \Phi_0(x) \leq -\frac{1}{2\lambda} < 0$. Thus, the alternative A_1) is satisfied.

Case 2. Suppose that $-\mathbf{1}_X \notin \overline{\mathbb{R}^+ A + \mathcal{C}_b^+(X)}$. Then, by the Hahn-Banach theorem, (using the fact that $\overline{\mathbb{R}^+ A + \mathcal{C}_b^+(X)}$ is a cone) there exists $\mu \in (\mathcal{C}_b(X))^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\langle \mu, h \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^+ A + \mathcal{C}_b^+(X). \quad (4)$$

Since, $(\mathcal{C}_b^+(X))^* = \cup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \overline{\text{conv}}^{w*} \{\delta_x : x \in X\}$ and $\mu \neq 0$, there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mu = \lambda\nu$ and $\nu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w*} \{\delta_x : x \in X\}$. We see from (4), that for all $\Phi \in A$, $\langle \nu, \Phi \rangle \geq 0$. Thus, the alternative A_2) is given.

Now, if moreover we assume that X is completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact space, then according to [29, Theorem 2.6] (see also [19, 27]), the pointwise topology and the weak topology $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_b(X), (\mathcal{C}_b(X))^*)$ agree on uniformly bounded, pointwise compact sets of continuous functions. Hence, if A is uniformly bounded and relatively compact for the topology τ_p of pointwise convergence on X then from the alternative A_2), we obtain that for all $\Phi \in \overline{A}^{\tau_p}$, $\langle \nu, \Phi \rangle \geq 0$. \square

Example 1. We can recover the result (mentioned above) of Fan, Glicksberg, and Hoffman in [13] as follows: we apply Theorem 1 with $X := \{f_i : i = 1 \dots n\}$ equipped with the discrete distance and $A := \text{conv}\{\chi_t : t \in C\} \subset \mathcal{C}(X) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$, where for each $t \in C$, the function $\chi_t : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $\chi_t(f) = f(x)$ for all $f \in X$.

For the rest of the work, we need the following four lemmas. The first three will be deduced by using Theorem 1.

Lemma 1. *Let X and Y be nonempty sets and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that $C_Y := \{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\} \subset \ell^\infty(X)$. Suppose that f is t -convexlike on X for some $t \in (0, 1)$. Then, there exists a net $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I} \subset X$ such that*

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y) \leq \sup_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Psi(x).$$

If moreover, we assume that f is supinf-concave on Y , then (see Definition 1)

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y).$$

Proof. Set $r := \sup_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Psi(x) > -\infty$. The inequality is trivial if $r = +\infty$. Suppose that $r < +\infty$. Let us equip X with the discrete distance so that $\ell^\infty(X) = \mathcal{C}_b(X)$. By applying Theorem 1 with the convex set $A := -\text{conv}(C_Y) + r$ and knowing that the alternative A_1) cannot be satisfied because of the choice of r , we get that there exists $\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*} \{\delta_x : x \in X\}$ such that $\langle \mu, \Psi \rangle \leq r$ for all $\Psi \in C_Y$. There exists a net $(\mu_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I} \subset \text{conv}(\delta(X))$ that w^* -converges to μ . For each $\alpha \in I$ there exists $n_\alpha \geq 2$, $x_1^\alpha, \dots, x_{n_\alpha}^\alpha \in X$ and $(\lambda_1^\alpha, \dots, \lambda_{n_\alpha}^\alpha) \in \Delta_{n_\alpha}$ such that $\mu_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} \lambda_i^\alpha \delta_{x_i^\alpha}$. Since f is t -convexlike on X , using Fact 1 in (1) we have: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{n_\alpha})$ and for $(a_1^\alpha, \dots, a_{n_\alpha}^\alpha) \in D_{n_\alpha}(t)$ such that $\max\{|\lambda_i^\alpha - a_i^\alpha| : i = 1, \dots, n_\alpha\} < \varepsilon\beta$, there exists $x_\alpha \in X$ satisfying: $\forall y \in Y$,

$$f(x_\alpha, y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} a_i^\alpha f(x_i^\alpha, y).$$

Set $\nu_\alpha := \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} a_i^\alpha \delta_{x_i^\alpha}$. We see that $\|\nu_\alpha - \mu_\alpha\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} (a_i^\alpha - \lambda_i^\alpha) \delta_{x_i^\alpha}\| \leq \varepsilon\beta n_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$. It follows that for all $f(\cdot, y) \in C_Y$ and all $\alpha \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_\alpha, y) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} a_i^\alpha f(x_i^\alpha, y) \\ &= \langle \mu_\alpha, f(\cdot, y) \rangle + \langle \mu_\alpha - \nu_\alpha, f(\cdot, y) \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \mu_\alpha, f(\cdot, y) \rangle + \varepsilon \|f(\cdot, y)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

So we have, for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y) &\leq \limsup_{\alpha} \langle \mu_\alpha, f(\cdot, y) \rangle + \varepsilon \|f(\cdot, y)\|_\infty \\ &= \langle \mu, f(\cdot, y) \rangle + \varepsilon \|f(\cdot, y)\|_\infty, \forall y \in Y. \end{aligned}$$

Sending ε to 0, we get that

$$\limsup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y) \leq \langle \mu, f(\cdot, y) \rangle \leq r := \sup_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Psi(x), \forall y \in Y.$$

If moreover we assume that f is supinf-concave on Y , then from Definition 1 we have $\sup_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Psi(x) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y)$. This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 1. The net $(x_\alpha)_\alpha$ can be replaced by a sequence $(x_n)_n$ in Lemma 1, whenever the space $\overline{\text{span}}\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\}$ is assumed to be a separable subspace of $\ell^\infty(X)$. Indeed, let us equip X with the discrete distance so that $\mathcal{C}_b(X)$ coincides with $\ell^\infty(X)$. The injective mapping $i : \overline{\text{span}}\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_b(X)$ is an isometry and the adjoint $i^* : \mathcal{C}_b(X)^* \rightarrow (\overline{\text{span}}\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\})^*$ is surjective (see for instance [2, Proposition 2]) and w^* -to- w^* continuous. Since $\overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))$ is w^* -compact in

$\mathcal{C}_b(X)^*$ then $K := i^*(\overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X)))$ is w^* -compact in $(\overline{\text{span}}\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\})^*$. Since $\overline{\text{span}}\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\}$ is separable, we have that $i^*(\overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X)))$ is metrizable. On the other hand, $\langle \mu, f(\cdot, y) \rangle = \langle i^*(\mu), f(\cdot, y) \rangle$ for all $\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))$ and all $y \in Y$. Thus, the same proof as in Lemma 1 applies by changing the net $\mu_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} \lambda_i^\alpha \delta_{x_i^\alpha}$, $\alpha \in I$ with a sequence $\mu_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \lambda_i^k \delta_{x_i^k}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2. *Let Ω be a completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact space and Φ be a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ such that $\text{conv}(\Phi)$ is uniformly bounded and relatively compact for the pointwise topology (in particular if Φ is uniformly bounded and equi-continuous). Then,*

$$\inf_{\phi \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)} \sup_{u \in \Omega} \phi(u) = \inf_{\phi \in \text{conv}(\Phi)} \sup_{u \in \Omega} \phi(u),$$

where τ_p denotes the topology of pointwise convergence.

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\inf_{\phi \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)} \sup_{u \in \Omega} \phi(u) < r \leq \inf_{\phi \in \text{conv}(\Phi)} \sup_{u \in \Omega} \phi(u). \quad (5)$$

By assumption Ω is pseudocompact and the set $\text{conv}(\Phi) - r$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ for the pointwise convergence on Ω . Thus, by applying Theorem 1 (the second part of the theorem) with the pseudocompact Ω and the set $A := \text{conv}(\Phi) - r \subset \mathcal{C}(\Omega)$, we get the following alternatives: either A_1) or A_2) is true, where

A_1) there exists $\bar{\phi} \in \text{conv}(\Phi)$ such

$$\sup_{u \in \Omega} \bar{\phi}(u) < r. \quad (6)$$

A_2) there exists $\nu^* \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}\{\delta_u : u \in \Omega\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\Omega)^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\langle \nu^*, \phi - r \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\phi \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$. In this case, let $(\nu_\alpha^*)_\alpha \subset \text{conv}(\{\delta_u : u \in \Omega\})$ be a net w^* -converging to ν^* . We see that $\langle \nu_\alpha^*, \phi \rangle \leq \sup_{u \in \Omega} \phi(u)$ for all $\phi \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$. Thus, taking the w^* -limit we get $r \leq \langle \nu^*, \phi \rangle \leq \sup_{u \in \Omega} \phi(u)$ for all $\phi \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$. Hence, we have

$$\inf_{\phi \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)} \sup_{u \in \Omega} \phi(u) \geq r. \quad (7)$$

Both the formulas in (6) and (7) contradict (5). \square

Recall that in a non-completely metrizable locally convex space, the closed convex hull of a compact set is not compact in general (see [1, Example 3.34, p. 185]). This explains why we assumed in Lemma 2 that $\text{conv}(\Phi)$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$ for the pointwise topology on Z . However, as it is shown in the following lemma, when Z is a countably compact space and Φ is nonempty uniformly bounded and relatively compact subset in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$, then τ_p -closed convex hull $\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$ is also compact in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$ for the pointwise topology.

Lemma 3. *Let Z be a countably compact space and Φ be a nonempty uniformly bounded and relatively compact subset in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$ for the pointwise topology denoted τ_p . Then, the τ_p -closed convex hull $\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$ is compact in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$ for the pointwise topology.*

Proof. Since $\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$ is uniformly bounded and τ_p -closed it is τ_p -compact in $\ell^\infty(Z)$. Indeed, since $\ell^\infty(Z) = (\ell^1(Z))^*$, then the topology τ_p and the weak* topology coincide on the bounded set $\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$ (see [28, Proposition 2.34]) and so we apply the Banach-Alaoglu-Bourbaki theorem. To conclude, it remains to

show that $\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi) \subset \mathcal{C}(Z)$. Set $K := (\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi), \tau_p)$ a compact Hausdorff space. For each $x \in Z$, the evaluation mapping $\chi_x : \phi \mapsto \phi(x)$ is bounded and continuous on K , hence $\chi_x \in \mathcal{C}(K)$. Moreover, the family $(\chi_x)_{x \in Z}$ is uniformly bounded on K since K is uniformly bounded on Z . Let $(\psi_\alpha)_\alpha \subset \text{conv}(\Phi)$ be a net. Since $\overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*} \{\delta_\phi : \phi \in K\}$ is w^* -compact in the dual space $(\mathcal{C}(K))^*$, there exists a subnet $(\delta_{\psi_{h(\alpha)}})_\alpha$ that w^* -converges to some μ^* in $(\mathcal{C}(K))^*$. In particular, $\delta_{\psi_{h(\alpha)}}(\chi_x) := \psi_{h(\alpha)}(x)$ converges to $\mu^*(\chi_x)$ in \mathbb{R} for every $x \in Z$. That is, $(\psi_{h(\alpha)})_\alpha$ converges pointwise to $\mu^* \circ \chi$. It remains to show that $\mu^* \circ \chi \in \mathcal{C}(Z)$, in other words, that $\mu^* \circ \chi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Indeed, clearly the map $\chi : Z \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}(K), \tau_p)$ defined by $\chi(x) := \chi_x$ is continuous, so using [20, Corollary 1.9 (a)], the set $\chi(Z)$ is relatively compact in $(\mathcal{C}(K), \tau_p)$ as image by the continuous mapping χ of the countably compact set Z . According to Grothendieck's theorem [11, Theorem 5], the pointwise topology and the weak topology $\sigma(\mathcal{C}(K), (\mathcal{C}(K))^*)$ agree on $\chi(Z)$. It follows that $\mu^* \circ \chi$ is continuous on Z . Finally, we proved that every net $(\psi_\alpha)_\alpha \subset \text{conv}(\Phi)$ has a subnet converging pointwise to an element of $\mathcal{C}(Z)$, that is, $\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi)$ is τ_p -compact in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$. \square

Let us recall the following well-know general fact, easy to establish.

Fact 2. If $K = \overline{\text{conv}}(C)$ is the closed convex hull of a subset C of some topological vector space and $\phi : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex (resp. concave) and continuous, then

$$\sup_{x \in \overline{\text{conv}}(C)} \phi(x) = \sup_{x \in \text{conv}(C)} \phi(x) = \sup_{x \in C} \phi(x).$$

(resp. $\inf_{x \in \overline{\text{conv}}(C)} \phi(x) = \inf_{x \in \text{conv}(C)} \phi(x) = \inf_{x \in C} \phi(x)$).

Lemma 4. Let X and Y be arbitrary nonempty sets and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Then, the following assertions hold.

(i) If f is *infsup-convex* on X and bounded on Y , then there exists $\nu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(Y))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) &= \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(Y))} \langle \mu, f(x, \cdot) \rangle = \sup_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(Y))} \inf_{x \in X} \langle \mu, f(x, \cdot) \rangle \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} \langle \nu, f(x, \cdot) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If f is *supinf-concave* on Y and bounded on X , then there exists $\nu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) &= \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))} \langle \mu, f(\cdot, y) \rangle = \inf_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, f(\cdot, y) \rangle \\ &= \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \nu, f(\cdot, y) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i) We equip Y with the discrete distance so that $\ell^\infty(Y) = \mathcal{C}_b(Y)$. From the boundedness of f on Y , we see that $f(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}_b(Y)$, for all $x \in X$. Notice that we always have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(Y))} \inf_{x \in X} \langle \mu, f(x, \cdot) \rangle &\leq \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(Y))} \langle \mu, f(x, \cdot) \rangle \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \text{ (using the Fact 2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We see that $\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) < +\infty$, by the boundedness of f on Y . If $\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = -\infty$, then the desired formula is trivial. Assume that

$$r := \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Using Theorem 1 with the convex set $A := \text{conv}\{f(x, \cdot) - r : x \in X\} \subset \mathcal{C}_b(Y)$, we obtain the following alternatives: either A_1) or A_2) is true, where

A_1) there exists $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$ and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \geq 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$ and

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (f(x_i, y) - r) < 0,$$

equivalently,

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f(x_i, y) < r.$$

A_2) there exists $\nu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*} \{\delta_y : y \in Y\}$, such that $\langle \nu, \Phi \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\Phi \in A$. In particular, we have $\inf_{x \in X} \langle \nu, f(x, \cdot) \rangle \geq r$.

The alternative A_1) is not satisfied. Indeed, suppose by contradiction that A_1) is true. Then, by setting $C_X := \{f(x, \cdot) : x \in X\}$ and by using the infsup-convexity of f on X , we get,

$$\begin{aligned} r := \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) &= \inf_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_X)} \sup_{y \in Y} \Psi(y) \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in Y} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f(x_i, y) \\ &< r \text{ (by the alternative } A_1). \end{aligned}$$

A contradiction. Hence, the alternative A_2) is true and so the part (i) is obtained by combining the alternative A_2) and the inequality in (8).

(ii) This part is similar to (i) it suffices to apply (i) with the function \tilde{f} defined from $Y \times X$ into \mathbb{R} by $\tilde{f}(y, x) = -f(x, y)$, for all $(y, x) \in Y \times X$. □

4. APPLICATIONS TO MINIMAX THEOREMS

This section is divided into two sub-sections. The first deals with minimax theorems in relation to Simons' inequality. In the second, we will consider a minimax theorem in the framework of pseudocompact spaces. These theorems are consequences of the results in the previous section.

4.1. Minimax theorem and Simons' inequality. The following theorems are extensions of the known minimax theorems of Fan, König and Simons in [23, Theorem 11, Theorem 12 & Theorem 26]. No topology on X and Y is assumed here.

Theorem 2. *Let X and Y be nonempty sets and $f, g : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two functions. Suppose that:*

- (i) f is bounded on X and t -convexlike on X for some $t \in (0, 1)$,
- (ii) the Simons' inequality holds, that is, for every net $(x_\alpha)_\alpha \subset X$,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y).$$

- (iii) g is supinf-concave on Y .

- (iv) $f \leq g$.

Then,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} g(x, y).$$

Proof. From (i) – (ii) and using Lemma 1, we get

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Psi(x).$$

Since, $f \leq g$, we see that $\sup_{\Psi \in \text{conv}(C_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Psi(x) \leq \sup_{\Phi \in \text{conv}(D_Y)} \inf_{x \in X} \Phi(x)$, where $D_Y := \{g(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\}$. Thus, using (iii) and Definition 1, we get

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} g(x, y).$$

□

We give an example where the Simon' inequality holds for arbitrary sets X and Y .

Example 2. Let X and Y be two nonempty sets, $\phi : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded function and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying for some $K > 0$:

$$|f(x_1, y) - f(x_2, y)| \leq K|\phi(x_1) - \phi(x_2)|, \forall x_1, x_2 \in X, \forall y \in Y.$$

Then, f satisfies the Simons' inequality.

Proof. Let I be a direct set and $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I} \subset X$ be a net. Since ϕ is bounded on X , $\phi(X)$ is relatively compact in \mathbb{R} . Thus, there exists a subnet $(x_{h(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in I}$ such that $\lim_\alpha \phi(x_{h(\alpha)})$ exists in \mathbb{R} . On the other hand, for all $\alpha, \beta \in I$ and all $y \in Y$,

$$f(x_{h(\beta)}, y) \leq f(x_{h(\alpha)}, y) + K|\phi(x_{h(\alpha)}) - \phi(x_{h(\beta)})|$$

Then, for all $\alpha, \beta \in I$ and all $y \in Y$:

$$f(x_{h(\beta)}, y) \leq \limsup_\alpha f(x_{h(\alpha)}, y) + K\left|\lim_\alpha \phi(x_{h(\alpha)}) - \phi(x_{h(\beta)})\right|$$

So, we get for all $\beta \in I$,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_\alpha f(x_{h(\alpha)}, y) + K\left|\lim_\alpha \phi(x_{h(\alpha)}) - \phi(x_{h(\beta)})\right|$$

By taking the limit over β , we obtain

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_\alpha f(x_{h(\alpha)}, y)$$

It follows that

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_\alpha f(x_\alpha, y).$$

Hence, the Simons' inequality holds. □

In fact, for the one-function minimax theorem, it turns out that Simons' inequality is a necessary and sufficient condition for obtaining minimax equality as soon as f is bounded and t -convexlike on X and s -concavelike on Y for some $t, s \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 3. *Let X and Y be nonempty sets and $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Suppose that f is bounded on X , t -convexlike on X for some $t \in (0, 1)$ and supinf-concave on Y .*

Then, the following assertions are equivalent.

(a) *The Simons' inequality holds, that is, for every net $(x_\alpha)_\alpha \subset X$,*

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_\alpha f(x_\alpha, y).$$

(b) *The minimax equality holds:*

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y).$$

Proof. (a) \implies (b). From the assumptions and using Lemma 1, it follows immediately that

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y).$$

The inverse inequality is always true.

(b) \implies (a). This implication is always true and requires no assumptions about X, Y and f . Indeed, clearly we have $\inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) \leq \limsup f(x_\alpha, y)$ for every net $(x_\alpha)_\alpha \subset X$ and every $y \in Y$. Thus, $\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_\alpha f(x_\alpha, y)$. \square

We have the following general example of minimax theorem which works for arbitrary sets X and Y .

Example 3. Let X, Y be nonempty sets, $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a function, $C \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a convex subset such that $\phi(X) \subset C$ and $\xi : C \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Suppose that:

(i) there exists $K > 0$ such that for each $y \in Y$, $\xi(\cdot, y)$ is non-decreasing and K -Lipschitz continuous and convex on C ,

(ii) ξ is supinf-concave on Y ,

(iii) ϕ is bounded on X and t -convexlike for some $t \in (0, 1)$, that is, for every $x_1, x_2 \in X$, there exists $x_3 \in X$ such that $\phi(x_3) \leq t\phi(x_1) + (1-t)\phi(x_2)$.

Then,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} \xi(\phi(x), y) = \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} \xi(\phi(x), y).$$

Proof. Set $f(x, y) = \xi(\phi(x), y)$ for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Then, f satisfies the Simons' inequality by Example 2. Since ϕ is t -convexlike and ξ is non-decreasing and convex on C , we get that f is t -convexlike on X . Since ξ is supinf-concave on Y , it follows that f is also supinf-concave on Y . Thus, we can apply Theorem 3. \square

The Simons' inequality is not always trivial and requires certain conditions, such as in Example 2 or the one (harder) established in [24, 7, 16] (see the proof of Corollary 2 below). However, this inequality is easily and always satisfied if X is a compact Hausdorff set and f is lower semicontinuous on X . Thus, we recover easily in the following corollary the Simons minimax theorem (with a slight improvement, since here g is assumed to be only supinf-concave on Y instead of being t -concavelike for some $t \in (0, 1)$).

Corollary 1. (Simons [23, Theorem 26] & [12, Theorem 2]) *Let Y be an arbitrary nonempty sets, X is a compact Hausdorff space and $f, g : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two functions bounded on X . Assume that:*

(i) f is t -convexlike for some $t \in (0, 1)$ and lower semicontinuous on X ,

(ii) g is supinf-concave on Y ,

(iii) $f \leq g$.

Then,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} g(x, y).$$

Proof. Let $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I} \subset X$ be a net. Then, there exists a subnet $(x_{h(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in I}$ that converges to some $\bar{x} \in X$ (since X is compact). By the lower semicontinuity of f on X , we have for all $y \in Y$, $f(\bar{x}, y) \leq \liminf_{\alpha} f(x_{h(\alpha)}, y) \leq \limsup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y)$. Thus, $\sup_{y \in Y} f(\bar{x}, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \sup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y)$. Finally, we have

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \sup_{\alpha} f(x_\alpha, y).$$

Hence, all of the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied, which gives the conclusion. \square

Thanks to Remark 1, if we assume that $\overline{\text{span}}\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\}$ is a separable subspace of $\ell^\infty(X)$, then we can replace the nets $(x_\alpha)_\alpha \subset X$ by sequences $(x_n)_n \subset X$ in the results of this section. Using Theorem 2 and [16, Theorem 2] (see also [7, Theorem 1]) we obtain the following minimax result. No assumption of compactness or semicontinuity is required.

Corollary 2. *Let Y be a nonempty set and let X be a subset of a Hausdorff topological vector space which is invariant under infinite convex combinations. Let $H, L : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two mappings such that*

(i) *H is bounded on $X \times Y$ and the functions $H(\cdot, y) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $y \in Y$, are convex and $H(\lambda x, y) = \lambda H(x, y)$, whenever $\lambda > 0$, $\lambda x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Assume moreover that, for every $x \in X$, there exists $y_x \in Y$ satisfying*

$$H(x, y_x) = \sup_{y \in Y} H(x, y).$$

- (ii) *$\overline{\text{span}}\{H(\cdot, y) : y \in Y\}$ is a separable subspace of $\ell^\infty(X)$.*
 (iii) *L is supinf-concave on Y ,*
 (iv) *$H \leq L$.*

Then,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} L(x, y).$$

Proof. Under the assumption (i), using [16, Theorem 2], we get that for every sequence $(x_n)_n \subset X$,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \limsup_n H(x_n, y).$$

We conclude using Remark 1 and Theorem 2. \square

We end this section with a minimax equality in Proposition 2 below, based on a previous work in [3]. Let X be a topological space and $(Y, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space included in $\mathcal{C}_b(X)$ and such that $\|\cdot\| \geq \|\cdot\|_\infty$ on Y . For a bounded from below function $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define the conjugate $h^\times : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h^\times(\xi) := \sup_{x \in X} \{\xi(x) - h(x)\}, \forall \xi \in Y.$$

A non-convex duality analogous to Fenchel duality based on this conjunction was introduced in [4] and studied in [4, 3]. Let us recall from [3] the following notions.

A subset A of Y is said to be a Δ_Y -set, if and only if there exists real numbers $(\lambda_x)_{x \in X} \in \mathbb{R}^X$ such that

$$A = \bigcap_{x \in X} \{\phi \in Y : \phi(x) \leq \lambda_x\}.$$

Clearly, a Δ_Y -set is a convex τ_p -closed subset of (Y, τ_p) . We say that the pair (X, Y) satisfies the property (H) if and only if, for each $x \in X$ and each open neighborhood U of x , there exists $\sigma : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sigma \in Y$, $\sigma(x) = 1$ and $\sigma(y) = 0$ for all $y \in X \setminus U$. Thanks to the Urysohn's lemma, if X is a normal Hausdorff space and $Y = \mathcal{C}_b(X)$ then (X, Y) has the property (H) . Other examples can be found in [3, Examples 1].

Proposition 2. *Let X be a normal Hausdorff space, $(Y, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space included in $\mathcal{C}_b(X)$ such that $\|\cdot\| \geq \|\cdot\|_\infty$ and (X, Y) has the property (H) . Let $A \subset Y$ be a Δ_Y -set. Then,*

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{\phi \in A} \phi(x) = \sup_{\phi \in A} \inf_{x \in X} \phi(x).$$

Proof. First, we prove that there exists a bounded from below lower semicontinuous function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $A = A_Y(f) := \{\psi \in Y : \psi \leq f\}$. Indeed, since A is a Δ_Y -set, there exists real numbers $\lambda_x \in \mathbb{R}$, for all $x \in X$, such that $A = \bigcap_{x \in X} \{\varphi \in Y : \varphi(x) \leq \lambda_x\}$. Let us set $f(x) := \sup_{\psi \in A} \psi(x)$, for all $x \in X$. Thus, we have $f(x) \leq \lambda_x < +\infty$ for all $x \in X$. It follows that f is lower semicontinuous as supremum of continuous function and $A_Y(f) \subset A$. Moreover, f is bounded from below, since there exists a bounded continuous function $\varphi \in A \subset \mathcal{C}_b(X)$ such that $-\infty < \inf_X \varphi \leq \varphi \leq f$. On the other hand, if $\varphi \in A$, then for all $x \in X$ we have $\varphi(x) \leq \sup_{\psi \in A} \psi(x) := f(x)$. This shows that $\varphi \in A_Y(f)$ and so that $A \subset A_Y(f)$. Hence $A = A_Y(f)$. By [3, Lemma 3] we have $f^\times(0) = \inf_{\phi \in A} \phi^\times(0)$, which is equivalent by the definitions to $\inf_{x \in X} f(x) = \sup_{\phi \in A} \inf_{x \in X} \phi(x)$. Finally, we obtain that $\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{\phi \in A} \phi(x) = \sup_{\phi \in A} \inf_{x \in X} \phi(x)$. \square

4.2. Minimax theorem in pseudocompact space. Recall that one form of the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem is the following: Let Z be a completely regular Hausdorff space and $\Phi \subset \mathcal{C}_b(Z)$ be a uniformly bounded and equicontinuous set of continuous functions, then Φ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$ for the topology of pointwise convergence on Z (see [29]). Notice also that if Φ is a uniformly bounded and equicontinuous set then $\text{conv}(\Phi)$ is also a uniformly bounded and equicontinuous set.

In the following result, we will not assume the t -convexlikness but only the infsup-convexity.

Theorem 4. *Let X be an arbitrary nonempty set and Y be a completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact space. Let $H, L : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two mappings, with H bounded on $X \times Y$ and L bounded on X and satisfying:*

- (i) H is infsup-convex on X and the family $\text{conv}(\{H(x, \cdot) : x \in X\})$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{C}(Y) = \mathcal{C}_b(Y)$, for the pointwise topology on Y (in particular if $\{H(x, \cdot) : x \in X\}$ is equi-continuous on Y),
- (ii) L is supinf-concave on Y ,
- (iii) $H \leq L$.

Then,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} L(x, y).$$

Proof. Since, H is bounded on $X \times Y$, then $\Phi := \{\delta_x \circ H := H(x, \cdot) : x \in X\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{C}_b(Y)$. We see by the definitions that

$$\overline{\text{conv}}^{\tau_p}(\Phi) = \{\mu \circ H : \mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))\},$$

$$\text{conv}(\Phi) = \{\mu \circ H : \mu \in \text{conv}(\delta(X))\}.$$

Thus, using Lemma 2 we get

$$\inf_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, H(\cdot, y) \rangle = \inf_{\mu \in \text{conv}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, H(\cdot, y) \rangle.$$

Since, H is infsup-convex on X (see Definition 1) then,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(x, y) = \inf_{\mu \in \text{conv}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, H(\cdot, y) \rangle = \inf_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, H(\cdot, y) \rangle.$$

Since $H \leq L$ and μ is positive whenever $\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))$, we have $\langle \mu, H(\cdot, y) \rangle \leq \langle \mu, L(\cdot, y) \rangle$, for all $y \in Y$ and all $\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))$. Using this fact and the above formulas, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(x, y) &= \inf_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, H(\cdot, y) \rangle \\ &\leq \inf_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, L(\cdot, y) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using the part (ii) of Lemma 4, since L is supinf-concave on Y and bounded on X ,

$$\sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} L(x, y) = \inf_{\mu \in \overline{\text{conv}}^{w^*}(\delta(X))} \sup_{y \in Y} \langle \mu, L(\cdot, y) \rangle.$$

Hence,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} H(x, y) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} L(x, y).$$

□

5. APPLICATIONS TO w^* -POINTWISE CONVERGENT SEQUENCE.

As an application, we obtain in Proposition 3 and Corollary 3 extensions of [7, Proposition] and [16, Corollary 2]. In Proposition 3, we deal with the real-valued case replacing compactness by pseudocompactness and in Corollary 3, we deal with the vector-valued case replacing compactness by countably compactness and the pointwise convergence will be replaced by the more general notion of w^* -pointwise convergence.

Proposition 3. *Let Z be a completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact space and $(f_n)_n$ be a uniformly bounded sequence of continuous functions from Z into \mathbb{R} . Suppose that*

- (i) *the sequence $(f_n)_n$ pointwise converges to 0 on Z ,*
- (ii) *the set $\text{conv}\{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{C}(Z)$ for the pointwise topology on Z .*

Then, there exists a sequence of linear convex combinations of (f_n) which is uniformly convergent to 0 on Z (that is $\|f_n\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$).

Proof. Define $C = \text{conv}\{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and the function $F : C \times Z \times [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F(f, x, t) = tf(x)$ and $\Phi := \{F(f, \cdot, \cdot) : f \in C\} \subset \mathcal{C}(Z \times [-1, 1])$. We are going to apply Theorem 4 with the functions $H = L = F$, the convex set $X = C$ and the completely regular Hausdorff pseudocompact space $Y = Z \times [-1, 1]$ (see [26, Lemma 4.3]). For this, we need to show that F is infsup-convex on C and supinf-concave on $Z \times [-1, 1]$ and that the $\text{conv}(\Phi)$ is uniformly bounded and relatively compact for the pointwise topology in $\mathcal{C}(Z \times [-1, 1])$. Indeed,

- (a) F is convex on C , hence it is in particular infsup-convex on C ,

(b) $\text{conv}(\Phi) = \Phi$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{C}(Z \times [-1, 1])$ since $(f_n)_n$ is uniformly bounded. On the other hand, using the assumption (ii), it is clear that $\text{conv}(\Phi)$ is relatively compact for the pointwise topology in $\mathcal{C}(Z \times [-1, 1])$.

(c) F is supinf-concave on $Z \times [-1, 1]$. Indeed, let $n \geq 2, x_1, \dots, x_n \in Z, t_1, \dots, t_n \in [-1, 1], (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \Delta_n$, we have

$$\inf_{f \in C} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i t_i f(x_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i t_i f_m(x_i), \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By taking the limit when $m \rightarrow +\infty$ in the above inequality and using (i), we see that: $\forall n \geq 2, \forall x_1, \dots, x_n \in Z, \forall t_1, \dots, t_n \in [-1, 1], \forall (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \Delta_n$

$$\inf_{f \in C} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i t_i f(x_i) \leq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ (x_1, t_1), \dots, (x_n, t_n) \in Z \times [-1, 1] \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Delta_n}} \inf_{x \in X} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i F(f, x_i, t_i) \leq 0$$

On the other hand,

$$\sup_{(x, t) \in Z \times [-1, 1]} \inf_{f \in C} F(f, x, t) \geq \sup_{x \in Z} \inf_{f \in C} F(f, x, 0) = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{(x, t) \in Z \times [-1, 1]} \inf_{f \in C} F(f, x, t) = \sup_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ (x_1, t_1), \dots, (x_n, t_n) \in Z \times [-1, 1] \\ (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Delta_n}} \inf_{x \in X} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i F(f, x_i, t_i) = 0.$$

This shows that F is supinf-concave on $Z \times [-1, 1]$.

Now, from (a), (b) and (c) and Theorem 4, we get that

$$\inf_{f \in C} \|f\|_\infty = \inf_{f \in C} \sup_{(x, t) \in Z \times [-1, 1]} F(f, x, t) = \sup_{(x, t) \in Z \times [-1, 1]} \inf_{f \in C} F(f, x, t) = 0.$$

Hence, there exists a sequence of linear convex combinations of (f_n) which is uniformly convergent to 0 on Z . \square

If we assume that Z is a countably compact space (a particular case of pseudocompact spaces [26]), then the condition (ii) in Proposition 3 is not a necessary condition because it would follow from (i) thanks to Lemma 3. Thus, we obtain the following corollary.

Let Z be a topological space, E be a Banach space and $(f_n)_n$ be a sequence of continuous functions from Z into E . We say that the E -valued sequence $(f_n)_n$, w^* -pointwise converges to 0 on Z if and only if the real-valued sequence $(p \circ f_n)_n$ pointwise converges to 0 on Z for every $p \in B_{E^*}$ (the closed unit ball of the dual E^*). Clearly, $(f_n)_n$, w^* -pointwise converges to 0 on Z whenever $(f_n)_n$, pointwise converges to 0 on Z (that is $\|f_n(x)\|_E \rightarrow 0, \forall x \in Z$).

Corollary 3. *Let Z be a completely regular Hausdorff countably compact space, E be a Banach space and $(f_n)_n$ be a uniformly bounded sequence of continuous functions from Z into E . Suppose that the sequence $(f_n)_n$, w^* -pointwise converges*

to 0 on Z . Then, there exists a sequence of linear convex combinations of (f_n) which is uniformly convergent to 0 on Z (that is $\|f_n\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$).

Proof. Define $\tilde{f}_n : Z \times B_{E^*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by $\tilde{f}_n(x, p) = p \circ f_n(x)$ for all $(x, p) \in Z \times B_{E^*}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the assumptions, we see easily that the real-valued sequence $(\tilde{f}_n)_n$ is uniformly bounded sequence of continuous functions from $Z \times B_{E^*}$ into \mathbb{R} and that the sequence $(\tilde{f}_n)_n$, pointwise converges to 0 on $Z \times B_{E^*}$. Since Z is Hausdorff countably compact space and B_{E^*} is w^* -compact (by the Banach-Alaoglu-Bourbaki theorem), it follows that the product space $Z \times B_{E^*}$ is completely regular Hausdorff countably compact space for the product topology (see [21]). Using Lemma 3, we get that the set $\text{conv}\{\tilde{f}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{C}(Z \times B_{E^*})$ for the pointwise topology on $Z \times B_{E^*}$. Hence, from Proposition 3, there exists a sequence of linear convex combinations of (\tilde{f}_n) which is uniformly convergent to 0 on $Z \times B_{E^*}$. Equivalently, there exists a sequence of linear convex combinations of (f_n) which is uniformly convergent to 0 on Z . \square

REFERENCES

1. C. D. Aliprantis, K. C. Border, *Infinite dimensional analysis A hitchhiker's guide* (3rded.). (Springer, 2006).
2. M. Bachir, *Porosity in the space of Holder-functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 509 (2022) 125946.
3. M. Bachir, *Convex extension of lower semicontinuous functions defined on normal Hausdorff space*, J. Convex Anal. 27, No. 3 (2020) 1033-1049.
4. M. Bachir, *A non-convex analogue to Fenchel duality* J. Funct. Anal. 181, No. 2 (2001) 300-312.
5. Craven B.D. , *Mathematical Programming and Control Theory*, Chapman & Hall, London, 1978.
6. B.D. Craven, B. Mond, *Transposition theorems for cone-convex functions*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 24 (1973), 603-612.
7. R. Deville, C. Finet, *An extension of Simons' inequality and applications*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. 14 (2001), 95-104. MR1851724 (2002g:46014)
8. M. R. Galán, *A theorem of the alternative with an arbitrary number of inequalities and quadratic programming*, Journal of Global Optimization, 69(2) (2017) 427-442.
9. M. R. Galán, *The Gordan theorem and its implications for minimax theory*, Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis 17 (2016), 2385-2405.
10. M. R. Galán, *An intrinsic notion of convexity for minimax*, Journal of Convex Analysis 21 (2014), 1105-1139.
11. A. Grothendieck, *Critères de compacité dans les espaces fonctionnels généraux*, Amer. J. Math. 74 (1952), 168-186.
12. K. Fan, *Minimax theorems*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 39 (1953), 42-47.
13. K. Fan, I. Glicksberg, A.J. Hoffman, *Systems of inequalities involving convex functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 8 (1957), 617-622.
14. V. Jeyakumar, *Convex-like alternative theorems and mathematical programming*, Optimization 16 (1985), 643-652.
15. V. Jeyakumar, W. Oettli, M. Natividad, *A solvability theorem for a class of quasiconvex mappings with applications to optimization*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 179, 537-546 (1993)
16. K. Kivisoo, E. Oja *Extension of Simons' inequality* Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 133, No. 12, (2005) 3485-3496
17. D. Luenberger, *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*, Wiley, New York, (1969).
18. S. Paeck, *Convexlike and concavelike conditions in alternative, minimax, and minimization theorems*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 74 (1992), No. 2, 317-332.
19. V. Ptak, *Concerning spaces of continuous functions*, Czechoslovak Math. J. 5(80) (1955), 412-431.

20. E. Reznichenko, *Extension of functions defined on products of pseudocompact spaces and continuity of the inverse in pseudocompact groups*, Topology and its Applications 59 (3) (1994) 233-244. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-8641\(94\)90021-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-8641(94)90021-3).
21. T. W. Rishel, *Products of countably compact spaces* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 58 (1976), 329-330
22. S. Simons, *Minimax and variational inequalities, are they of fixed point or Hahn-Banach type? Game theory and mathematical economics*, North Holland (1981) 379-388,.
23. S. Simons, *Minimax theorems and their proofs, Minimax and applications*, Nonconvex Optim. Appl., vol. 4, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, (1995), 1-23.
24. S. Simons, *A convergence theorem with boundary*, Pacific J. Math. (40), 1972, 703-708.
25. A. Stefanescu, *A theorem of the alternative and a two-function minimax theorem*, Journal of Applied Mathematics (2004), 169-177.
26. R. M. Stephenson, Jr., *Pseudocompact spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 134 (1968), 437-448.
27. S. Tomasek, *On a certain class of bigwedge-structures. I, II*, Czechoslovak Math. J. 20(95) (1970), 1-18; 19-33.
28. N. Weaver, *Lipschitz Algebras*, World Scientific, Second edition, New Jersey (2018).
29. R. F. Wheeler *Weak and Pointwise Compactness in the Space of Bounded Continuous Functions* Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 266, No. 2 (1981), pp. 515-530.

LABORATOIRE SAMM 4543, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS 1 PANTHÉON-SORBONNE, FRANCE
Email address: Mohammed.Bachir@univ-paris1.fr