

On C -Pareto dominance in decomposably C -antichain-convex sets

Maria Carmela Ceparano
University of Naples Federico II
email: mariacarmela.ceparano@unina.it

Federico Quartieri
University of Florence
email: federico.quartieri@unifi.it

September 4, 2019

Abstract

This paper shows that—under suitable conditions on a cone C —any element in the convex hull of a decomposably C -antichain-convex set Y is C -Pareto dominated by some element of Y . Building on this, the paper proves the disjointness of the convex hulls of two disjoint decomposably C -antichain-convex sets whenever one of latter is C -upward. These findings are used to obtain several consequences on the structure of the C -Pareto optima of decomposably C -antichain-convex sets, on the separation of decomposably C -antichain-convex sets and on the convexity of the set of maximals of C -antichain-convex relations and of the set of maximizers of C -antichain-quasiconcave functions. Special emphasis is placed on the invariance of the solution set of a problem after its “convexification”.

Keywords: Antichain-convexity; Convexification; Pareto optimality; Maximal elements; Separation

AMS Classification: 52A01; 54F05; 58E17.

1 Introduction

Generalized convexity plays an important role in optimization theory as well as in its applications to mathematical economics. In this paper we deal with two mathematical issues that are of interest to mathematical economics: the separation of possibly non-convex sets and the convexity of the set of maximals (resp. maximizers) of a possibly non-convex relation (resp. possibly non-quasiconcave function). The first type of results can be used, for instance, in welfare economics in order to obtain variants of the classical “Second Welfare Theorem”:

within the mathematical strand of literature motivated by the influential paper [15], we mention [21, 22, 4, 20, 24, 3, 12, 13, 18, 16, 9]. The second type of results can be used, for instance, in demand theory where the convexity of the solutions of a consumer’s constrained maximization problem is a property with useful consequences for the theory of general equilibrium: see, e.g., [5, Chapter 18]—as well as the literature cited therein—for illustrations of the use of convex-valued (excess) demand correspondences in the proofs of the existence of an equilibrium price. Even if through this work we shall explain the economic motivation for the structure of some specific optimization problems considered, the focus of the paper is only on the mathematical aspects of such problems.

The key-notion employed in our analysis combines convexity notions with order-theoretic ones. Any cone C in a real vector space V generates a binary relation R_C on V defined by

$$(x, y) \in R_C \text{ if and only if } y - x \in C.$$

The notion of C -antichain-convexity stipulates the usual definition of convexity only for pairs of vectors that are unrelated through R_C . Such a notion has been introduced¹ in [9], where it is shown that the Minkowski sum of two C -antichain-convex sets is convex if one of the two summands is C -upward (a set is C -upward whenever its Minkowski sum with the cone C is included in the set itself). This mathematical fact—which properly generalizes the assertion that the sum of two convex sets is convex—is used in that article to prove a separation theorem for possibly non-convex sets.

In the present work we show two other useful properties of decomposably C -antichain-convex sets (i.e., of sets that can be expressed as the Minkowski sum of C -antichain-convex sets). The first—see Lemma 5 and its generalization in Theorem 3—is the existence, under suitable conditions on a cone C and for any element x in the convex hull of a decomposably C -antichain-convex set S , of a C -Pareto dominating element y in S (i.e., of an element y in S whose difference $y - x$ with x is a vector in the cone C). The second—see Theorem 6—is the disjointness of the convex hulls of two disjoint decomposably C -antichain-convex sets whenever one of latter is C -upward.

The first property on the existence of a C -Pareto dominating element has a crucial role in proving that—in some constrained optimization problems—the set of maximals of certain C -antichain-convex relations coincides with that of their convexifications. Also, that property has an important role in the proof that, under suitable condition on the cone C , the set of C -Pareto optima of a decomposably C -antichain-convex set equals that of its convex hull (this can have implications also for results on the existence of Pareto optima like, e.g., those in [17]). From the influential article [27], that made use of the Shapley-Folkman theorem, many non-convex optimization problems in mathematical economics have been tackled by considering their “convexification”. A similar approach—partly motivated by the mentioned problems in mathematical economics—has

¹Under a much more particular form, however, a variant of that definition had already appeared in [8] to prove a fixpoint theorem of Krasnoselskii type.

been taken in pure optimization theory: see, in particular, [11] for a discussion. The essential difference between our and those results is that the convexity of optimal solutions is here directly obtained for the problem under consideration, rather than as a limit or an approximated solution.

The second property has several consequences and can be suitably—though not necessarily directly—used to extend some results of the literature about the separation of disjoint convex sets. This paper shows that such extensions are possible not only in the case of classical separation theorems which involve nonempty topological interiors—or closed and compact sets—that can be found in standard textbooks (like, e.g., [19]) but also in the case of more recent results which dispense with such assumptions (like, e.g., those in [28] which use the quasi-relative interiority notion introduced by [6]).

The paper is organized as follows. Sect. 2 recalls some definitions and shows some facts. Sect. 3 proves the main result about the existence of C -Pareto dominating elements and shows a useful consequence on the structure of the C -Pareto optima of decomposably C -antichain-convex sets. Sect. 4 elaborates on the main result showing sufficient conditions for the convex hulls of disjoint decomposably C -antichain-convex sets to be disjoint. Sect. 5 applies the previous results to obtain various separation theorems for C -antichain-convex sets and Sect. 6 investigates on the convexity of the set of maximals (resp. maximizers) of C -antichain-convex relations (resp. C -antichain-quasiconcave functions).

2 Preliminary definitions, notation and facts

In this Sect. 2 we fix the general definitions and notation used through the entire paper and we point out some general facts. More specific definitions and notation will be introduced and recalled at the beginning of the sections where they will be used.

Relations Let S be a set. A **relation** R on S is a subset of $S \times S$: when $(t, s) \in R$ we say that t is **R -related with** s . Given a relation R on S , the set $R(s)$ defined by

$$R(s) = \{t \in S : (t, s) \in R\}$$

will henceforth denote the **set of all elements of S that are R -related with s** . A relation R on S is: **total** iff for all $(s, t) \in S \times S$ we have that either $t \in R(s)$ or $s \in R(t)$; **transitive** iff for all $(r, s, t) \in S \times S \times S$ such that $r \in R(s)$ and $s \in R(t)$ we have $r \in R(t)$; a **total preorder** iff R is total and transitive.

Maximals

Let R be a relation on a set X and S be a subset of X . An element $m \in S$ is **R -maximal on S** iff

$$s \in S \text{ and } s \in R(m) \Rightarrow m \in R(s).$$

The **set of all R -maximals on S** is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(R, S)$.

Lemma 1 *Let R be a total relation on a set X . Assume that $S \subseteq X$. Then $m \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$ if and only if $m \in R(s)$ for all $s \in S$.*

Proof. *If part.* Suppose $m \in R(s)$ for all $s \in S$. The definition of a R -maximal element on S directly implies that m is R -maximal on S . So $m \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$.

Only if part. Suppose $m \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$ and s is an arbitrary element of S . If $m \notin R(s)$ then the totality of R implies $s \in R(m)$ and we obtain a contradiction with the assumption that $m \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$. Therefore $m \in R(s)$ for all $s \in S$. ■

Remark 1 is an immediate consequence of Lemma 1.

Remark 1 *Let X be a set and $S \subseteq X$. Let $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and R be the relation on X defined by*

$$R(x) = \{y \in X : u(y) \geq u(x)\} \text{ for all } x \in X. \quad (1)$$

Then R is a total preorder and $\arg \max_{s \in S} u(s) = \mathcal{M}(R, S)$.

Lemma 2 *Let R^\bullet and R° be relations on a set X . Assume that $S \subseteq X$ and that R^\bullet is total. If $R^\bullet \subseteq R^\circ$ then $\mathcal{M}(R^\bullet, S) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(R^\circ, S)$.*

Proof. Assume that $R^\bullet \subseteq R^\circ$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(R^\bullet, S)$. By way of contradiction, suppose $m \notin \mathcal{M}(R^\circ, S)$. Then there exists $s \in S$ such that $s \in R^\circ(m)$ and $m \notin R^\circ(s)$. Lemma 1 ensures that $m \in R^\bullet(s)$. As $m \notin R^\circ(s)$, the assumption that $R^\bullet \subseteq R^\circ$ implies $m \notin R^\bullet(s)$: a contradiction with $m \in R^\bullet(s)$. ■

Lemma 3 *Suppose R is a total preorder on a set X . Assume that $S \subseteq X$, that $x \in S$ and that $y \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$.*

1. *If $x \in R(y)$ then $x \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$.*
2. *If $s \in S$ and $s \notin R(x)$ then $y \in R(s)$ and $s \notin R(y)$.*

Proof. 1. Suppose $x \in R(y)$. As $y \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$, Lemma 1 ensures that $y \in R(s)$ for all $s \in S$. The transitivity of R then implies that $x \in R(s)$ for all $s \in S$. Noted this, Lemma 1 ensures that $x \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$.

2. Suppose $s \in S$ and $s \notin R(x)$. Then Lemma 1 ensures that $y \in R(s)$ and $s \notin \mathcal{M}(R, S)$. As $s \notin \mathcal{M}(R, S)$, part 1 of Lemma 3 implies $s \notin R(y)$. ■

Spaces and operators

A real vector space is henceforth abbreviated by RVS. Analogously, a topological real vector space is abbreviated by TRVS and a locally convex topological real vector space by LCS. When V is a TRVS, its topological dual is henceforth denoted by V^* . The Minkowski sum of two subsets A and B of a RVS is denoted by $A + B$ and we simply denote by $A - B$ the Minkowski sum of A and $-B$; when $A = \{a\}$ we simply write $a + B$ instead of the more cumbersome $\{a\} + B$. Let V be a RVS, a subset C of V is a **cone in V** iff $\lambda C \subseteq C$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ (and hence a cone need not be nonempty and need not contain the zero vector). A cone C in a RVS is a **pointed cone** iff $C \cap -C \subseteq \{0\}$.

Remark 2 A cone C in a RVS is convex if and only if $C + C \subseteq C$.

Lemma 4 Let V be a RVS and C be a convex cone in V .

1. Then $C \cup \{0\}$ is a convex cone.
2. Suppose C is pointed. Then $C \setminus \{0\}$ is a convex cone.

Proof. 1. Put $C_0 = C \cup \{0\}$. Part 1 of Lemma 1 in [9] guarantees that C_0 is a cone in V . We are done if we show that $C_0 + C_0 \subseteq C_0$. Noting that

$$C_0 + C_0 = (C \cup \{0\}) + (C \cup \{0\}) = (C + C) \cup C \cup C \cup \{0\}$$

because of basic properties of the Minkowski sum and that $C + C \subseteq C$ by the convexity of the cone C , we conclude that $C_0 + C_0 \subseteq C_0$.

2. The fact that $C \setminus \{0\}$ is a cone follows immediately from the definition of a cone. To prove that $C \setminus \{0\}$ is convex just note that the convex combination of any two points in $C \setminus \{0\}$ belongs to C by the convexity of C and that it cannot be equal to the vector zero as C is pointed. ■

Let V be a RVS and X be a subset of V . We denote by $\text{co}(X)$ (resp. $\text{cone}(X)$, $\text{aff}(X)$) the convex hull (resp. the conic hull, the affine hull) of X recalling that $\text{cone}(X) = \{\lambda x : (\lambda, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times X\}$ and hence that $\text{cone}(X)$ contains the zero vector whenever $X \neq \emptyset$. When V is endowed with some topology, we denote by $\text{bd}(X)$ (resp. $\text{int}(X)$, $\text{cl}(X)$) the boundary (resp. the topological interior, the topological closure) of X .

Cone-based relational and convexity notions Let V be a RVS, C be a cone in V and S be a subset of V . The following four definitions have been introduced in [9]—and we refer to the mentioned article for a discussion—while the last definition is a new cone-based extension of the notion of an antichain. We say that:

- S is **C -antichain-convex** iff

$$(x, y, \lambda) \in S \times S \times [0, 1] \text{ and } y - x \notin C \cup -C \Rightarrow \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in S;$$

- S is **decomposably C -antichain-convex** iff there exists a finite collection $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ of C -antichain-convex subsets of V such that

$$S = S_1 + \dots + S_n;$$

- S is **C -upward** iff

$$(x, y) \in S \times S \text{ and } y - x \in C \Rightarrow y \in S;$$

- S is **C -downward** iff

$$(x, y) \in S \times S \text{ and } x - y \in C \Rightarrow y \in S;$$

- S is a C -antichain iff

$$(x, y) \in S \times S \text{ and } x \neq y \Rightarrow y - x \notin C \cup -C.$$

Recall that when $C \subseteq \{0\}$ any convex set is both C -antichain-convex and C -upward (as well as C -downward).

Remark 3 Let V be a RVS, C be a cone in V and S be a subset of V . Noting that $-C$ is a cone, from the previous definitions it follows that S is (decomposably) C -antichain-convex if and only if S is (decomposably) $-C$ -antichain-convex and that S is C -downward if and only if S is $-C$ -upward.

The following facts are two general results of some importance for the sequel of this work. Theorem 1 is essentially new while Theorem 2 uses—but does not directly follow from—a previous result shown in [9].

Theorem 1 Let V be a RVS, C be a cone in V and S be a subset of V .

1. S is $\text{co}(C)$ -upward if and only if S is C -upward.
2. S is $\text{co}(C)$ -downward if and only if S is C -downward.

Proof. 1. As $C \subseteq \text{co}(C)$, if S is $\text{co}(C)$ -upward then part 2 of Proposition 6 in [9] guarantees that S is C -upward. So henceforth suppose S is C -upward. We are done if we show that S is $\text{co}(C)$ -upward. When either S or C is empty, the assertion is trivially true. So suppose S and C are nonempty and pick $s \in S$ and $c \in \text{co}(C)$. Thus there exist n elements c_1, \dots, c_n in C and α in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n such that $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n = 1$ and $c = \alpha_1 c_1 + \dots + \alpha_n c_n$. As C is a cone, we have that $\alpha_i c_i \in C$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Put $x_0 = s$ and $x_i = x_{i-1} + \alpha_i c_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Reasoning by induction, note that $x_i \in S$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ as it is the sum of the element x_{i-1} of the C -upward set S and of the element $\alpha_i c_i$ of the cone C . Being $x_n = s + c$, we conclude that S is $\text{co}(C)$ -upward.

2. A consequence of part 1 of Theorem 1, Remark 3 and the fact that $\text{co}(-C) = -\text{co}(C)$. ■

Theorem 2 Let V be a RVS and C be a cone in V . Suppose X is a decomposably C -antichain-convex subset of V .

1. If X is C -upward then X is convex.
2. If X is C -downward then X is convex.

Proof. 1. Suppose X is C -upward. The decomposable C -antichain-convexity of X implies the existence of C -antichain-convex subsets X_1, \dots, X_n of V such that $X_1 + \dots + X_n = X$. Put

$$C_0 = C \cup \{0\} \text{ and } K = \text{co}(C_0).$$

Part 6 of Proposition 3 in [9] and the inclusion $C \subseteq K$ guarantee that X_1, \dots, X_n are K -antichain-convex. Part 1 of Lemma 4 in [9] and part 1 of Theorem 1 guarantee that X is K -upward. As X is K -upward and K contains the zero vector, part 3 of Lemma 5 in [9] implies $X + K = X$ and hence

$$X = X_1 + \dots + X_n + K.$$

So X can be expressed as the sum of $n + 1$ sets which are K -antichain-convex subsets of V . Note that K (i.e., the last of the $n + 1$ addends) is also K -upward: this is a consequence of the fact that K is a convex cone (see Remark 2). So X is convex by part 1 of Corollary 1 in [9].

2. A consequence of part 1 of Theorem 2 and Remark 3. ■

3 Existence of C -Pareto dominating elements

3.1 Preliminary definitions

Let V be a RVS, C be a cone in V and Y be a subset of V . An element v of V is **C -Pareto dominated** by an element z of V iff $z \in v + C$. When $v \in V$ is C -Pareto dominated by $z \in V$, we say that z is **C -Pareto dominating** v . An element y of Y is a **C -Pareto optimum of Y** iff the sets $Y \setminus \{y\}$ and $y + C$ are disjoint. The **set of C -Pareto optima of Y** is denoted by $\mathcal{O}(C, Y)$.

Remark 4 *The notion of a C -Pareto optimum is not new. For instance, when C is a cone containing the zero vector, the definition of a C -Pareto optimum boils down to that of Pareto optimality with respect to C in [17, Definition 1] and, when C is a closed convex cone containing the zero vector, our definition is the exact “dual” of that of a Pareto minimal point given in [25, Definition 9.1]. On the relation with other nonequivalent definitions—and on the implications of the pointedness of C —see the discussion at p. 452 in [25].*

3.2 Main result

Lemma 5 guarantees the existence of C -Pareto dominating elements. Lemma 5, as generalized by Theorem 3, is the main finding of the paper and plays an important role in many subsequent results.

Lemma 5 *Let V be a RVS and C be a convex cone in V containing the zero vector. Suppose Y is a C -antichain-convex subset of V .*

1. *Each y in $\text{co}(Y)$ is C -Pareto dominated by at least one z in Y .*
2. *Each y in $\text{co}(Y)$ is C -Pareto dominating at least one x in Y .*

Proof. 1. Part 1 of Lemma 5 is true if we show the validity of the following (equivalent) assertion.

Assertion. *If y can be expressed as the convex combination of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ elements of Y then there exists z in Y such that $z \in y + C$.*

The Assertion is trivially true if $n = 1$ in that $0 \in C$. The rest of the proof is by induction. Let $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and assume as an induction hypothesis that the Assertion is true if $n < m - 1$. We show that the Assertion is true when $n = m$. Assume that $n = m$ and that y can be expressed as the convex combination of m elements of Y . Then there exist y_1, \dots, y_m in Y and α in \mathbb{R}_+^m such that $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_m = 1$ and

$$y = \alpha_1 y_1 + \dots + \alpha_m y_m.$$

Because of the induction hypothesis, we can assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. Put

$$y_0 = \frac{\alpha_2 y_2 + \dots + \alpha_m y_m}{1 - \alpha_1} \text{ and } \alpha_0 = 1 - \alpha_1.$$

Note that

$$y = \alpha_0 y_0 + (1 - \alpha_0) y_1.$$

and that y_0 is the convex combination of the $m - 1$ elements y_2, \dots, y_m with coefficients $\alpha_2/(1 - \alpha_1), \dots, \alpha_m/(1 - \alpha_1)$. Then the induction hypothesis guarantees the existence of $c_0 \in C$ such that

$$y_0 + c_0 \in Y.$$

• If $y_0 + c_0 \notin y_1 + (C \cup -C)$ then $\alpha_0(y_0 + c_0) + (1 - \alpha_0)y_1 \in Y$ by the C -antichain-convexity of Y . So

$$y + \alpha_0 c_0 = \alpha_0 y_0 + (1 - \alpha_0) y_1 + \alpha_0 c_0 \in Y.$$

Noting that $\alpha_0 c_0$ is an element of the cone C , we conclude that the Assertion is true: just identify z with $y + \alpha_0 c_0$.

• If $y_0 + c_0 \in y_1 + C$ then $y_0 + c_0 = y_1 + c_1$ for some $c_1 \in C$. So

$$(1 - \alpha_0)(y_0 + c_0) = (1 - \alpha_0)(y_1 + c_1).$$

Adding the vector $\alpha_0(y_0 + c_0)$ to both sides of the previous equality we get

$$y_0 + c_0 = \alpha_0 y_0 + (1 - \alpha_0) y_1 + \alpha_0 c_0 + (1 - \alpha_0) c_1 = y + \alpha_0 c_0 + (1 - \alpha_0) c_1.$$

The convexity of the cone C implies $\alpha_0 c_0 + (1 - \alpha_0) c_1 \in C$ and hence

$$y_0 + c_0 \in y + C.$$

We conclude that the Assertion is true: just identify z with $y_0 + c_0$.

• If $y_0 + c_0 \in y_1 - C$ then $y_0 + c_0 = y_1 - c_1$ for some $c_1 \in C$. So

$$y_1 - y_0 = c_0 + c_1.$$

The convexity of C then implies $c_0 + c_1 \in C$ and hence $y_1 - y_0 \in C$. Therefore $\alpha_0(y_1 - y_0) \in C$. Note that $y_1 - y = y_1 - (\alpha_0 y_0 + (1 - \alpha_0)y_1) = \alpha_0(y_1 - y_0)$ and hence that

$$y_1 - y \in C.$$

So $y_1 = y + c$ for some $c \in C$. We conclude that the Assertion is true: just identify z with y_1 .

2. A consequence of part 1 of Lemma 5 and Remark 3. ■

Theorem 3 *Let V be a RVS and C be a cone in V . Suppose Y is a decomposably C -antichain-convex subset of V and put $K = \text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$.*

1. *Each y in $\text{co}(Y)$ is K -Pareto dominated by at least one z in Y .*

2. *Each y in $\text{co}(Y)$ is K -Pareto dominating at least one x in Y .*

Proof. 1. The assumption that Y is decomposably C -antichain-convex implies the existence of C -antichain-convex subsets Y_1, \dots, Y_n of V such that $Y = Y_1 + \dots + Y_n$. The set K is a convex cone in V containing the zero vector. As $C \subseteq K$, part 6 of Proposition 3 in [9] ensures that Y_1, \dots, Y_n are K -antichain-convex. Suppose $y \in \text{co}(Y)$. As the convex hull of the Minkowski sum of n sets equals the Minkowski sum of their convex hulls, we have that

$$y \in \text{co}(Y_1) + \dots + \text{co}(Y_n).$$

So there exists a tuple (y_1, \dots, y_n) in $\text{co}(Y_1) \times \dots \times \text{co}(Y_n)$ such that $y = y_1 + \dots + y_n$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, part 1 of Lemma 5 implies the existence of $z_i \in Y_i$ such that y_i is K -Pareto dominated by z_i . Thus $z_i - y_i \in K$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and so the convexity of the cone K and Remark 2 together imply

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - y_i) \in K. \quad (2)$$

Put $z = z_1 + \dots + z_n$ and note that $z \in Y$ and that (2) is equivalent to $z - y \in K$. Therefore $z \in y + K$ and hence y is K -Pareto dominated by $z \in Y$.

2. A consequence of part 1 of Theorem 3 and Remark 3. ■

3.3 On C -Pareto optima

Theorem 4 shows a result of independent interest elucidating on the maximality of Pareto optima. Theorem 5 is the main result of this Sect. 3.3. It guarantees the equivalence of the set of C -Pareto optima of a decomposably C -antichain-convex set Y and that of its convex hull when C is a pointed convex cone. The last result has consequences of interest for economic theory.²

²To provide a tangible example of an implication of economic interest, note that part 2 of Theorem 5 allows us to generalize Proposition 5.F.2 in [23] by replacing in its statement “convex” with “decomposably \mathbb{R}_+^n -antichain-convex” since any production vector that is profit-maximizing on $\text{co}(Y)$ must be profit-maximizing on Y .

Theorem 4 *Let V be a RVS, C be a cone in V and Y be a subset of V . Let D be the relation on Y defined by*

$$D(y) = \{x \in Y : y \text{ is } C\text{-Pareto dominated by } x\}.$$

1. *Then $\mathcal{O}(C, Y) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(D, Y)$.*
2. *Assume that C is pointed. Then $\mathcal{O}(C, Y) = \mathcal{M}(D, Y)$.*

Proof. 1. Suppose $y^* \in \mathcal{O}(C, Y)$. If $y^* \notin \mathcal{M}(D, Y)$ then there exists $y \in Y$ such that $y \in D(y^*)$ and $y^* \notin D(y)$: therefore $y^* \neq y \in Y$ and $y \in y^* + C$ getting a contradiction with the assumption that $y^* \in \mathcal{O}(C, Y)$. So $y^* \in \mathcal{M}(D, Y)$.

2. By virtue of part 1 of Theorem 4, we are done if we show that $\mathcal{M}(D, Y) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C, Y)$. Its proof is as follows. Assume that $m \in \mathcal{M}(D, Y)$, that $x \in Y$ and that $x \in m + C$: we conclude showing that $x = m$. The definition of D and the membership $x \in m + C$ implies $x \in D(m)$: the D -maximality of m in turn entails that $m \in D(x)$ and so that $m \in x + C$. The memberships $x \in m + C$ and $m \in x + C$ imply $x = m$ by the pointedness of C . ■

Lemma 6 *Let V be a RVS, C be a cone in V and Y be a subset of V . Then $\mathcal{O}(C, Y) = \mathcal{O}(C \cup \{0\}, Y)$.*

Proof. Put $C_0 = C \cup \{0\}$. Part 1 of Lemma 1 in [9] guarantees that C_0 is a cone in V . Noted this, Lemma 6 is a consequence of the observation that $Y \setminus \{y\}$ and $y + C$ are disjoint if and only if so are $Y \setminus \{y\}$ and $y + C_0$. ■

Theorem 5 *Let V be a RVS, C be a convex cone in V and Y be a decomposably C -antichain-convex subset of V .*

1. *Then $\mathcal{O}(C, \text{co}(Y)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C, Y)$.*
2. *Assume that C is pointed. Then $\mathcal{O}(C, Y) = \mathcal{O}(C, \text{co}(Y))$.*

Proof. Put $C_0 = C \cup \{0\}$. The set C_0 is a convex cone by part 1 of Lemma 4. So $C_0 = \text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$.

1. By virtue of Lemma 6, the inclusion $\mathcal{O}(C, \text{co}(Y)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C, Y)$ is equivalent to the inclusion $\mathcal{O}(C_0, \text{co}(Y)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C_0, Y)$. To conclude the proof we show the validity of the last inclusion, as follows. Suppose $y \in \mathcal{O}(C_0, \text{co}(Y))$. We are done if we show that $y \in Y$. As $y \in \text{co}(Y)$, part 1 of Theorem 3 implies the existence of $z \in Y$ such that $z \in y + C_0$. As $y \in \mathcal{O}(C_0, \text{co}(Y))$, we must have that $y = z$. So $y \in Y$.

2. Part 1 of Theorem 5 ensures that $\mathcal{O}(C, \text{co}(Y)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C, Y)$. So we are done if we prove that $\mathcal{O}(C, Y) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C, \text{co}(Y))$. By virtue of Lemma 6, we are done if we prove that

$$\mathcal{O}(C_0, Y) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(C_0, \text{co}(Y)).$$

The proof of the last inclusion is as follows. Suppose $y \in \mathcal{O}(C_0, Y)$ and, by way of contradiction, suppose $y \notin \mathcal{O}(C_0, \text{co}(Y))$: then there exists $c \neq 0$ in C_0 such that $y + c \in \text{co}(Y)$. Part 1 of Theorem 3 implies the existence of $z \in Y$ such

that $z \in y + c + C_0$. Note that the convex cone C_0 is pointed and hence that $c + C_0 \subseteq C_0 \setminus \{0\} = C \setminus \{0\}$ as $c \neq 0$. The membership $z \in y + c + C_0$ and the inclusion $c + C_0 \subseteq C \setminus \{0\}$ imply $z \in y + C_0$ and $z \neq y$: as $z \in Y$, we have obtained a contradiction with the assumption that $y \in \mathcal{O}(C_0, Y)$. ■

4 On disjoint convex hulls

Lemma 7 guarantees that the convex hulls of disjoint C -antichain-convex sets are disjoint whenever one of the C -antichain-convex sets is C -upward (or, dually, C -downward). Theorem 6 generalizes to decomposably C -antichain-convex sets.

Lemma 7 *Let V be a RVS and C be a convex cone in V containing the zero vector. Suppose X and Y are disjoint C -antichain-convex subsets of V .*

1. *Suppose X is C -upward. Then $\text{co}(X)$ and $\text{co}(Y)$ are disjoint.*
2. *Suppose X is C -downward. Then $\text{co}(X)$ and $\text{co}(Y)$ are disjoint.*

Proof. 1. Proposition 2 in [9] and part 1 of Proposition 5 in [9] guarantee that X is convex. So $X = \text{co}(X)$ and we are done if we prove that $X \cap \text{co}(Y) = \emptyset$. By way of contradiction, suppose $X \cap \text{co}(Y) \neq \emptyset$ and pick $y \in X \cap \text{co}(Y)$. As $y \in X$ and X is C -upward, part 1 of Lemma 5 in [9] implies that

$$y + C \subseteq X. \quad (3)$$

As $y \in \text{co}(Y)$, part 1 of Lemma 5 guarantees the existence of

$$x \in Y \quad (4)$$

such that $x \in y + C$. The previous membership and (3) imply $x \in X$: a contradiction with (4) and the assumption that X and Y are disjoint.

2. A consequence of part 1 of Lemma 7 and Remark 3. ■

Theorem 6 *Let V be a RVS and C be a cone in V . Assume that X and Y are decomposably C -antichain-convex subsets of V .*

1. *Suppose X is C -upward. Then $\text{co}(X)$ and $\text{co}(Y)$ are disjoint.*
2. *Suppose X is C -downward. Then $\text{co}(X)$ and $\text{co}(Y)$ are disjoint.*

Proof. 1. Part 1 of Theorem 2 ensures that X is convex. The assumption that Y is decomposably C -antichain-convex implies the existence of C -antichain-convex subsets Y_1, \dots, Y_n of V such that $Y = Y_1 + \dots + Y_n$. Put

$$Z = X + (-Y_1) + \dots + (-Y_{n-1})$$

and note that $Z \cap Y_n = \emptyset$.³ The sets $-Y_1, \dots, -Y_{n-1}$ are C -antichain-convex by part 6 of Lemma 3 in [9]. So Z is convex and C -upward by part 1 of Corollary

³Letting D , E and F be subsets of a RVS, to prove the previous equality note that $D \cap (E + F) = \emptyset$ if and only if $(D - E) \cap F = \emptyset$.

1 in [9] and hence $Z = \text{co}(Z)$. Put $C_0 = C \cup \{0\}$ and $K = \text{co}(C_0)$. Part 6 of Proposition 3 in [9] and the inclusion $C \subseteq K$ imply the K -antichain-convexity of Y_n . Part 1 of Lemma 4 in [9] and part 1 of Theorem 1 guarantee that Z is K -upward. So part 1 of Lemma 7 ensures that $\text{co}(Z) \cap \text{co}(Y_n) = \emptyset$ and the equality $Z = \text{co}(Z)$ in turn implies

$$Z \cap \text{co}(Y_n) = \emptyset. \quad (5)$$

The definition of Z and the fact that the convex hull of the Minkowski sum of n sets equals the Minkowski sum of their convex hulls entail that

$$Z = \text{co}(Z) = \text{co}(X) - (\text{co}(Y_1) + \dots + \text{co}(Y_{n-1})). \quad (6)$$

The equalities in (5) and (6) yield

$$(\text{co}(X) + (-\text{co}(Y_1)) + \dots + (-\text{co}(Y_{n-1}))) \cap \text{co}(Y_n) = \emptyset$$

and so $\text{co}(X) \cap (\text{co}(Y_1) + \dots + \text{co}(Y_n)) = \emptyset$. As the Minkowski sum of the convex hulls of n sets equals the convex hull of their Minkowski sum, the previous equality implies $\text{co}(X) \cap \text{co}(Y) = \emptyset$.

2. A consequence of part 1 of Theorem 6 and Remark 3. ■

Corollary 1 is a consequence of Theorem 6. The motivation for explicitly considering X and Y as the Minkowski sums of sets is due to the possible applications of this type of results. We shall return on this point in Sect. 5.

Corollary 1 *Let V be a RVS and C be a cone in V . Assume that $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ are C -antichain-convex subsets of V . Put*

$$X = X_1 + \dots + X_m \quad \text{and} \quad Y = Y_1 + \dots + Y_n$$

and assume that X and Y are disjoint.

1. *Suppose X_1 is C -upward. Then $\text{co}(X)$ and $\text{co}(Y)$ are disjoint.*
2. *Suppose X_1 is C -downward. Then $\text{co}(X)$ and $\text{co}(Y)$ are disjoint.*

Proof. A consequence of Corollary 1 in [9] and Theorem 6. ■

5 Separation

Some of the previous results are now applied to obtain separation theorems that dispense with the assumption of convexity (at least for one of the two separated sets). All our applications hinge on—and extend—known theorems of the literature about the separation of convex sets. After recalling some definitions in Sect. 5.1, we subsequently present new results on the separation of two decomposably C -antichain-convex sets. Results about the separation of not necessarily convex sets that are Minkowski sums of other sets is of interest

in economics as they allow to extend the classical Second Welfare Theorem(s) for convex economies to economies with non-convexities (we refer to [9] for a longer discussion and for a concrete application of a version of a separation theorem similar—albeit nonequivalent—to that presented in Sect. 5.2). The result in Sect. 5.2 posits the nonemptiness of the topological interior of one of the separated sets: in Sect. 5.3 and 5.4 the applications dispense with such an assumption. In Sect. 5.4 we build on a separation theorem due to [28] which employs the quasi-relative interiority notion. Other results and discussions on the separation of convex sets that use the quasi-relative interiority notion can be found, for instance, in [7, 10, 2, 30].

5.1 Preliminary definitions

Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology, let X , Y and Z be subsets of V and let $f \in V^*$. We say that: f **separates** X and Y iff $\sup f[X] \leq \inf f[Y]$; f **properly separates** X and Y iff f separates X and Y and $\inf f[X] < \sup f[Y]$; f **strictly separates** X and Y iff $\sup f[X] < \inf f[Y]$.⁴ Moreover, we say that: X and Y are **separated** iff there exists $f \in V^* \setminus \{0\}$ that separates X and Y ; X and Y are **properly separated** iff there exists $f \in V^*$ that properly separates X and Y ; X and Y are **strictly separated** iff there exists $f \in V^*$ that strictly separates X and Y . Assuming the convexity of Z —and following the notation in [25] and [28]—we say that:

- the **relative interior** of Z is the set

$$\text{ri}(Z) = \{z \in Z : \exists \text{ a neighborhood } U \text{ of } z \text{ such that } U \cap \text{cl}(\text{aff}(Z)) \subseteq Z\};$$

- the **intrinsic relative interior** of Z is the set

$$\text{iri}(Z) = \{z \in Z : \text{cone}(Z - z) \text{ is a subspace of } V\};$$

- the **quasi-relative interior** of Z is the set

$$\text{qri}(Z) = \{z \in Z : \text{cl}(\text{cone}(Z - z)) \text{ is a subspace of } V\};$$

- the set Z is **quasi-regular** iff $\text{iri}(Z) = \text{qri}(Z)$.

Finally, we recall the following known facts:

- $\text{int}(Z) \subseteq \text{ri}(Z) \subseteq \text{iri}(Z) \subseteq \text{qri}(Z)$;
- $\text{int}(Z) = \text{ri}(Z) = \text{iri}(Z) = \text{qri}(Z)$ whenever $\text{int}(Z) \neq \emptyset$;
- $\text{int}(Z) \subseteq \text{ri}(Z) = \text{iri}(Z) = \text{qri}(Z) \neq \emptyset$ whenever V is finite-dimensional.

⁴Consequently: f separates X and Y iff $f(x) \leq g(y)$ for all $(x, y) \in X \times Y$; f properly separates X and Y iff $f(x) \leq g(y)$ for all $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ and there exists $(x_0, y_0) \in X \times Y$ such that $f(x_0) < g(y_0)$; f strictly separates X and Y iff $f(x) < g(y)$ for all $(x, y) \in X \times Y$.

In the sequel we shall make use of Corollary 2 that follows as a consequence of Theorem 7 below. Theorem 7 is in fact a restatement of Theorem 5 in [9] and hence we omit its proof.⁵

Theorem 7 *Let V be a TRVS and C be a cone in V . Assume that X and Y are nonempty subsets of V and suppose $f \in V^* \setminus \{0\}$ separates X and Y .*

1. *If X is C -upward then f is nonpositive on C .*
2. *If X is C -downward then f is nonpositive on C .*

Corollary 2 *Let V be a TRVS and C be a cone in V . Assume that X and Y are nonempty subsets of V and suppose $f \in V^* \setminus \{0\}$ separates X and Y .*

1. *If X is C -upward then f is nonpositive on $\text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$.*
2. *If X is C -downward then f is nonpositive on $\text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$.*

Proof. Suppose X is C -upward (resp. C -downward). Pick an arbitrary $k \in \text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$. Then there exist n elements c_1, \dots, c_n in $C \cup \{0\}$ and α in \mathbb{R}_+^n such that $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n = 1$ and $k = \alpha_1 c_1 + \dots + \alpha_n c_n$. The linearity of f then implies that $f(k) = \alpha_1 f(c_1) + \dots + \alpha_n f(c_n)$. Part 1 (resp. Part 2) of Theorem 7 ensures that $f(c_i) \leq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and so $f(k) \leq 0$. ■

5.2 Nonempty topological interior

Theorem 8 *Let V be a TRVS and C be a cone in V . Assume that $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ are nonempty C -antichain-convex subsets of V . Put*

$$X = X_1 + \dots + X_m \text{ and } Y = Y_1 + \dots + Y_n.$$

Suppose $\text{int}(X) \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{int}(X) \cap Y = \emptyset$.

1. *If X_1 is C -upward then X and Y are separated.*
2. *If X_1 is C -downward then X and Y are separated.*

Proof. 1. Suppose X_1 is C -upward. As X_1 is C -antichain-convex and C -upward, part 1 of Corollary 1 in [9] ensures that X is convex. The topological interior of a convex set is convex (see, e.g., Theorem 1.1.2 in [29]): thus $\text{co}(\text{int}(X)) = \text{int}(X)$ and part 1 of Corollary 1 ensures that $\text{int}(X) \cap \text{co}(Y) = \emptyset$. Consequently, the Separation Theorem 14.2 in [19] guarantees the existence of f in $V^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sup f[X] \leq \inf f[\text{co}(Y)]$. As $\emptyset \neq Y \subseteq \text{co}(Y)$ we have that $\inf f[\text{co}(Y)] \leq \inf f[Y]$. We conclude that $\sup f[X] \leq \inf f[Y]$.

2. A consequence of part 1 of Theorem 8 and Remark 3. ■

⁵Just note that in the mentioned article the definition of a separating functional is reversed with respect to that used here (and that no topological assumption is needed).

5.3 Closed and compact sets

Theorem 9 *Let V be a LCS and C be a cone in V . Assume that X and Y are nonempty decomposably C -antichain-convex subsets of V . Suppose X is closed, $\text{co}(Y)$ is compact and $X \cap Y = \emptyset$.*

1. *If X is C -upward then X and Y are strictly separated.*
2. *If X is C -downward then X and Y are strictly separated.*

Proof. 1. Suppose X is C -upward. As X is decomposably C -antichain-convex and C -upward, part 1 of Theorem 2 ensures the convexity of X . So $\text{co}(X) = X$ and part 1 of Theorem 6 implies $X \cap \text{co}(Y) = \emptyset$. Thus, by Corollary 14.4 in [19] there exists $f \in V^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sup f[X] < \inf f[\text{co}(Y)]$. As $\emptyset \neq Y \subseteq \text{co}(Y)$, we have that $\inf f[\text{co}(Y)] \leq \inf f[Y]$. We conclude that $\sup f[X] < \inf f[Y]$.

2. A consequence of part 1 of Theorem 9 and Remark 3. ■

Corollary 3 is a simple consequence for the finite-dimensional case.

Corollary 3 *Let C be a cone in \mathbb{R}^n . Assume that X and Y are nonempty closed decomposably C -antichain-convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^n . Suppose Y is bounded and $X \cap Y = \emptyset$.*

1. *If X is C -upward then X and Y are strictly separated.*
2. *If X is C -downward then X and Y are strictly separated.*

Proof. The convex hull of a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n is compact: see, e.g., Corollary 5.33 in [1]. Said this, the assertion follows directly from Theorem 9. ■

5.4 Quasi-relative interior

In the following Lemma 8 we use the characterization of a quasi-relative interior as enunciated in Lemma 3.6 in [28]. Other characterizations have been proved in the literature (like, e.g., Proposition 2.16 in [6] or Theorem 2.3 in [14]): we use that in [28] for expositional convenience.

Lemma 8 *Let V be a LCS and let C be a cone in V . Assume that X is a convex subset of V .*

1. *If X is C -upward, then $\text{qri}(X)$ is C -upward.*
2. *If X is C -downward, then $\text{qri}(X)$ is C -downward.*

Proof. 1. Suppose X is C -upward. The proof is trivial if either $\text{qri}(X) = \emptyset$ or $C = \emptyset$. Henceforth suppose $\text{qri}(X) \neq \emptyset$ or $C \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $z \in \text{qri}(X)$ and $c \in C$. Putting

$$t = z + c, \tag{7}$$

we are done if we show that $t \in \text{qri}(X)$. By way of contradiction, suppose $t \notin \text{qri}(X)$. Lemma 3.6 in [28] implies that X and $\{t\}$ can be properly separated and so there exists $f \in V^* \setminus \{0\}$ and $x_0 \in X$ such that

$$f(x) \leq f(t) \text{ for all } x \in X \quad (8)$$

and

$$f(x_0) < f(t). \quad (9)$$

Proper separation implies separation: part 1 of Theorem 7 then ensures that

$$f(c) \leq 0. \quad (10)$$

By the linearity of f , from (8), (7) and (10) we infer that

$$f(x) \leq f(z) \text{ for all } x \in X \quad (11)$$

and from (9), (7) and (10) we infer that

$$f(x_0) < f(z). \quad (12)$$

Then, inequalities in (11) and (12) imply that X and $\{z\}$ are properly separated and Lemma 3.6 in [28] in turn implies that $z \notin \text{qri}(X)$: a contradiction with the assumption that $z \in \text{qri}(X)$.

2. A consequence of part 1 of Lemma 8 and Remark 3. ■

Theorem 10 *Let V be a LCS and let C be a cone in V . Assume that X and Y are two nonempty decomposably C -antichain-convex subsets of V .*

1. *Assume that X is C -upward, that $\text{iri}(X) \neq \emptyset$, that $\text{iri}(\text{co}(Y)) \neq \emptyset$, that $\text{qri}(X) \cap Y = \emptyset$ and that $X - Y$ is quasi-regular. Then X and Y are properly separated.*
2. *Assume that X is C -downward, that $\text{iri}(X) \neq \emptyset$, that $\text{iri}(\text{co}(Y)) \neq \emptyset$, that $\text{qri}(X) \cap Y = \emptyset$ and that $X - Y$ is quasi-regular. Then X and Y are properly separated.*

Proof. 1. As X is decomposably C -antichain-convex and C -upward, part 1 of Theorem 2 ensures the convexity of X . Moreover, part 6 of Lemma 3 in [9] and part 1 of Corollary 1 in [9] ensure the convexity of $X - Y$. So

$$X - Y = \text{co}(X - Y) = \text{co}(X) - \text{co}(Y) = X - \text{co}(Y). \quad (13)$$

The equalities in (13) and the quasi-regularity of $X - Y$ entail the quasi-regularity of $X - \text{co}(Y)$. The set $\text{qri}(X)$ is C -upward by part 1 of Lemma 8 and is convex by Proposition 2.11 in [6]. The assumption that $\text{qri}(X) \cap Y = \emptyset$ and part 1 of Theorem 6 ensure that

$$\text{qri}(X) \cap \text{co}(Y) = \emptyset. \quad (14)$$

As $\text{qri}(\text{co}(Y)) \subseteq \text{co}(Y)$, the equality in (14) implies

$$\text{qri}(X) \cap \text{qri}(\text{co}(Y)) = \emptyset. \quad (15)$$

As $X - \text{co}(Y)$ is quasi-regular, the equality in (15) and the assumptions that $\text{iri}(X) \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{iri}(\text{co}(Y)) \neq \emptyset$ allow the applicability of Theorem 5.3 in [28], which ensures the existence of $f \in V^* \setminus \{0\}$ and $(x_0, t_0) \in X \times \text{co}(Y)$ such that

$$f(x) \leq f(t) \text{ for all } (x, t) \in X \times \text{co}(Y) \quad (16)$$

and

$$f(x_0) < f(t_0). \quad (17)$$

As $Y \subseteq \text{co}(Y)$, from (16) we infer that

$$f(x) \leq f(y) \text{ for all } (x, y) \in X \times Y. \quad (18)$$

As $t_0 \in \text{co}(Y)$ and Y is decomposably C -antichain-convex, part 2 of Theorem 3 ensures the existence of $y_0 \in Y$ such that $y_0 \in t_0 - \text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$. So there exists $k \in \text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$ such that $t_0 = y_0 + k$. The inequality in (18) ensures that f separates X and Y : the inequality in (17), the linearity of f and part 1 of Corollary 2 then imply

$$f(x_0) < f(t_0) = f(y_0) + f(k) \leq f(y_0). \quad (19)$$

So the inequalities in (18) and (19) imply the proper separation of X and Y .

2. A consequence of part 1 of Theorem 10 and Remark 3. ■

Corollary 4 is a simple consequence for the finite-dimensional case.

Corollary 4 *Let C be a cone in \mathbb{R}^n and assume that X and Y are two nonempty decomposably C -antichain-convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^n .*

1. *If X is C -upward and $\text{ri}(X) \cap Y = \emptyset$ then X and Y are properly separated.*
2. *If X is C -downward and $\text{ri}(X) \cap Y = \emptyset$ then X and Y are properly separated.*

Proof. Corollary 4 is a direct consequence of Theorem 10: just note that $V = \mathbb{R}^n$ implies $\text{qri}(X) = \text{iri}(X) = \text{ri}(X) \neq \emptyset$, $\text{iri}(\text{co}(Y)) = \text{ri}(\text{co}(Y)) \neq \emptyset$ and the quasi-regularity of $X - Y$. ■

6 Maximals and maximizers

We now investigate the structure of maximals of a C -antichain-convex relation and that of the maximizers of a C -antichain-quasiconcave function for some constrained optimization problems that can be frequently encountered in economics. After proving some general facts about the C -antichain-convexity of

optimal solutions in Sect. 6.2 and some sufficient conditions that guarantee their incomparability (with respect to the relation generated by the cone C) in Sect. 6.3, we show a result on the convexity of the set of optimal solutions of non-convex optimization problems in Sect. 6.4. Finally, in Sect. 6.5, we consider the subtler problem of identifying conditions under which the set of maximals of a relation is equal to that of its convexification.

6.1 Preliminary definitions

In this Sect. 6.1 we fix the definitions and notation used in the remainder of paper. We refer to Sect. 2 for all general definitions concerning relations.

Relations and functions

Let V be a RVS and R be a relation on a convex subset X of V . Then

- the **convexification** of R is the relation R^{co} on X defined by

$$R^{\text{co}}(x) = \text{co}(R(x)) \text{ for all } x \in X. \quad (20)$$

Let V be a RVS, let C be a cone in V and let X be a C -antichain-convex subset of V . Also, let R be a relation on X and $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Like in [9], we say that:

- R is **C -antichain-convex** iff $R(x)$ is C -antichain-convex for all $x \in X$;
- u is **C -antichain- quasiconcave** iff $\{x \in X : u(x) \geq \lambda\}$ is C -antichain-convex for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 5 *Let V be a RVS, C be a cone in V and $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function on a C -antichain-convex set $X \subseteq V$. The C -antichain-quasiconcavity of u implies the C -antichain-convexity of the relation R defined by (1) in Remark 1.*

Local nonsatiation

Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a subset of V . A relation R on X is **locally nonsatiated** iff

$$x \in \text{cl}(\{y \in X : y \in R(x) \text{ and } x \notin R(y)\}) \text{ for all } x \in X;$$

a function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **locally nonsatiated** iff

$$x \in \text{cl}(\{y \in X : u(y) > u(x)\}) \text{ for all } x \in X.$$

Note that the operator cl is meant with respect to the topology of V .

Remark 6 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function on subset X of V . Then the local nonsatiation of u is equivalent to the local nonsatiation of the relation R defined by (1) in Remark 1.*

Positivity

Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a subset of V . A continuous linear functional on V that is positive on $X \setminus \{0\}$ is called a **positive functional on X** . The set P_X defined by

$$P_X = \{f \in V^* : f(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in X \setminus \{0\}\}$$

is the **set of all positive functionals on X** . For any $w \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in V^*$, put

$$F_f^w = \{v \in V : f(v) \leq w\}$$

and $B_{f,X}^w = \{x \in X : f(x) \leq w\}$. Clearly,

$$B_{f,X}^w = F_f^w \cap X.$$

Mathematically, is immaterial to name F_f^w and $B_{f,X}^w$. However, those sets have an economic meaning explained in Remark 7 which justifies our notation.

Remark 7 *The economic interpretation of V , X , P_X , F_f^w and $B_{f,X}^w$ is as follows: V is the set of all commodity vectors and X that of all consumption vectors; $f \in P_X$ is a price functional (or better, $f(x)$ is the expenditure⁶ of a consumer for $x \in X$); F_f^w is the **set of all financially feasible commodity vectors** and $B_{f,X}^w$ is that of all financially feasible consumption vectors also called the **budget set**. The set $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$ is the **demand** of a consumer with a preference relation R and wealth w , who chooses a consumption vector out of X facing a price functional f .*

6.2 Antichain-convexity of sets of maximals and of sets of maximizers

Theorem 11 and Corollary 5 show general facts on the antichain-convexity of the set of maximals of a relation and of the set of maximizers of a function.

Theorem 11 *Let V be a RVS and C be a cone in V . Suppose X and S are C -antichain-convex subsets of V such that $S \subseteq X$. Besides suppose R is a total and C -antichain-convex relation on X . Then $\mathcal{M}(R, S)$ is C -antichain-convex.*

Proof. Suppose m^\bullet and m° are elements of $\mathcal{M}(R, S)$ such that

$$m^\bullet - m^\circ \notin (C \cup -C). \quad (21)$$

Pick an arbitrary $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and put $m = \lambda m^\bullet + (1 - \lambda)m^\circ$. We are done if we show that $m \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$. Pick an arbitrary $s \in S$. As m^\bullet and m° are elements of $\mathcal{M}(R, S)$, Lemma 1 ensures that

$$m^\bullet \in R(s) \text{ and } m^\circ \in R(s). \quad (22)$$

As $R(s)$ is a C -antichain-convex subset of S , from (21) and (22) we infer that $m \in R(s)$. This suffices to conclude that $m \in \mathcal{M}(R, S)$. ■

⁶When $V = \mathbb{R}^n$, the value of the price functional at the consumption $x \in X$ specifies the expenditure px given by the scalar product of $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and x : the vector p is called a price (and should not be confused with the price functional which specifies the expenditure).

Corollary 5 *Let V be a RVS and C be a cone in V . Suppose X and S are C -antichain-convex subsets of V such that $S \subseteq X$. Besides suppose $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is C -antichain-quasiconcave. Then $\arg \max_{s \in S} u(s)$ is C -antichain-convex.*

Proof. A consequence of Remark 5 and Theorem 11. ■

6.3 Antichains of maximals and of maximizers

Theorem 12 and Corollary 6 show sufficient conditions for the set of maximals of a relation and for that of maximizers of a function to be C -antichains.

Lemma 9 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology. Suppose $(w, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times V^*$. Then*

$$z \in \text{bd}(F_f^w) \Rightarrow f(z) = w.$$

Proof. Suppose $z \in \text{bd}(F_f^w)$. Put $A =] - \infty, w[$ and $B =]w, +\infty[$. As the sets A and B are \mathbb{R} -open and $f \in V^*$, we have that the sets $f^{-1}[A]$ and $f^{-1}[B]$ are V -open. Therefore, if $f(z) < w$ then there exists a V -neighborhood N_z of z such that $f(v) < w$ for all $v \in N_z$ while if $f(z) > w$ then there exists a V -neighborhood N_z of z such that $f(v) > w$ for all $v \in N_z$: a contradiction with $z \in \text{bd}(F_f^w)$. So $f(z) = w$. ■

Remark 8 *As it is clear from the proof of Lemma 9, the linearity of f can be dispensed with in the statement of Lemma 9. We assume it only for expositional convenience.*

Lemma 10 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a cone in V . Suppose $(w, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times P_X$. Then $\text{bd}(F_f^w)$ is an X -antichain.*

Proof. Suppose x and y are distinct elements in $\text{bd}(F_f^w)$. By way of contradiction, suppose

$$y - x \in X \cup -X. \tag{23}$$

Lemma 9 implies

$$f(y) = f(x). \tag{24}$$

As y and x are distinct, we have that

$$y - x \neq 0. \tag{25}$$

The assumption $f \in P_X$ implies the positivity of f at all nonzero vectors in X and the negativity of f at all nonzero vectors in $-X$. Consequently, $f(y-x) \neq 0$ by virtue of (23) and (25). The linearity of f in turn implies $f(y) \neq f(x)$: a contradiction with (24). ■

Theorem 12 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a cone in V . Suppose $(w, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times P_X$ and R is a locally nonsatiated total relation on X . Then $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$ is an X -antichain included in $\text{bd}(F_f^w)$.*

Proof. By virtue of Lemma 10, we are done if we show that $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w) \subseteq \text{bd}(F_f^w)$. By contradiction, suppose

$$m \in \mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w) \quad (26)$$

and

$$m \notin \text{bd}(F_f^w). \quad (27)$$

As $m \in B_{f,X}^w \subseteq F_f^w$, from (27) we infer that $m \in \text{int}(F_f^w)$. The previous membership implies the existence of a V -neighborhood N_m of m such that $N_m \subseteq F_f^w$ and the local nonsatiation of R in turn implies the existence of $x \in N_m \cap X$ such that

$$x \in R(m) \text{ and } m \notin R(x). \quad (28)$$

As $x \in N_m \cap X \subseteq F_f^w \cap X$, noting that $X \cap F_f^w = B_{f,X}^w$ we conclude that $x \in B_{f,X}^w$: a contradiction with (26) and (28). ■

Corollary 6 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a cone in V . Suppose $(w, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times P_X$ and R is a locally nonsatiated total relation on X . If $C \subseteq X$ is a cone in V then $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$ is a C -antichain included in $\text{bd}(F_f^w)$.*

Proof. Theorem 12 ensures that $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$ is an X -antichain. A fortiori, $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$ is a C -antichain. ■

6.4 Convexity of sets of maximals and of sets of maximizers

Using the results obtained in Sect. 6.2 and 6.3, Theorems 13 and 14 derive sufficient conditions for the convexity of the set of maximals of a relation and for that of maximizers of a function.

Theorem 13 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a convex cone in V . Suppose $(w, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times P_X$ and R is a locally nonsatiated total relation on X . If $C \subseteq X$ is a cone in V and R is C -antichain-convex then $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$ is a convex C -antichain included in $\text{bd}(F_f^w)$.*

Proof. The set F_f^w is readily seen to be convex. So also $B_{f,X}^w$ is convex (as it is the intersection of the convex sets X and F_f^w). A fortiori, $B_{f,X}^w$ is C -antichain-convex by Proposition 2 in [9]. Said this, Theorem 13 is a consequence of Theorem 11 and Corollary 6. ■

Theorem 14 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a convex cone in V . Suppose $(w, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times P_X$ and $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a locally nonsatiated function. If $C \subseteq X$ is a cone in V and u is C -antichain-quasiconcave then $\arg \max_{x \in B_{f,X}^w} u(x)$ is a convex C -antichain included in $\text{bd}(F_f^w)$.*

Proof. A consequence of Theorem 13 and Remarks 5 and 6. ■

Theorems 13 and 14 are of importance to economics as they show that, in many optimization problems which can be encountered therein, the usual convexity assumptions are not necessary and can be relaxed. More concretely—and keeping in mind footnote 6—given a real-valued locally nonsatiated (utility) function u on $X = \mathbb{R}_+^n$, Theorem 14 guarantees that the convexity of the Walrasian demand correspondence $x : \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow 2^X$ defined by

$$x(p, w) = \operatorname{arg\,max}_{s \in \{y \in X : py \leq w\}} u(s),$$

(with py representing the expenditure at y given a price $p \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ and w representing the consumer's wealth) obtains when u is \mathbb{R}_+^n -antichain-quasiconcave: the stronger assumption of quasiconcavity is not necessary. So, for instance, Theorem 14 guarantees that the real-valued (locally nonsatiated) function u on $X = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ defined by

$$u(x_1, x_2) = \frac{x_1 x_2}{x_1 + 1} - 5x_1 + x_2$$

(which is \mathbb{R}_+^2 -antichain-quasiconcave, albeit not quasiconcave, by Example 9 and Remark 8 in [9]) generates a convex-valued demand correspondence.

6.5 On invariance under convexification

The previous theorems are not sufficient to guarantee the equivalence of the set of maximals of a relation and that of its convexification. Theorem 15 shows that a strengthening of the conditions posited in Theorem 13 allows to obtain the desired equivalence result. The most important additional assumption that we impose is the existence of a maximal. In finite-dimensional spaces, the compactness of the (budget) set $B_{f,X}^w$ obtains under reasonable economic assumptions and the existence of maximals is not a real issue; in infinite-dimensional spaces, however, the compactness of $B_{f,X}^w$ does not generally hold and maximals need not exist. The difficult issue of the existence of maximals in infinite-dimensional spaces has been investigated and has received some answers: see [26] and the literature cited therein.

Theorem 15 *Let V be a RVS endowed with some topology and X be a convex cone in V containing the zero vector. Suppose $(w, f) \in \mathbb{R} \times P_X$ and R is a locally nonsatiated total preorder relation on X . If $C \subseteq X$ is a convex cone in V and R is C -antichain-convex then*

$$\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w) \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w) = \mathcal{M}(R^{c^0}, B_{f,X}^w).$$

Proof. Recall that $C \cup \{0\}$ is a convex cone in V by virtue of part 1 of Lemma 4. Part 2 of Lemma 3 in [9] implies that $R(v)$ is $C \cup \{0\}$ -antichain-convex for all $v \in X$. Recalled these facts and that $0 \in X$ by assumption, henceforth suppose without loss of generality that $0 \in C$. The previous membership and

the convexity of C imply $C = \text{co}(C \cup \{0\})$. As $R \subseteq R^{\text{co}}$, we have that R^{co} is total. Noted this, we can apply Lemma 2 concluding that

$$\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(R^{\text{co}}, B_{f,X}^w). \quad (29)$$

Suppose $\mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w) \neq \emptyset$ and pick an arbitrary

$$y \in \mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w). \quad (30)$$

We conclude the proof showing that the converse of the inclusion in (29) is true. So, suppose that

$$m \in \mathcal{M}(R^{\text{co}}, B_{f,X}^w) \quad (31)$$

and, by way of contradiction, that $m \notin \mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$: then there exists $y^* \in B_{f,X}^w$ such that $y^* \in R(m)$ and

$$m \notin R(y^*). \quad (32)$$

By part 2 of Lemma 3, from (30) and (32) we infer that $y \in R(m)$ and

$$m \notin R(y). \quad (33)$$

By Lemma 1, the totality of R^{co} and the membership in (31) imply $m \in R^{\text{co}}(y)$: part 2 of Lemma 5 in turn implies the existence of an element

$$x \in R(y) \quad (34)$$

such that $x \in m - C$. From (33) and (34) we conclude that $x \neq m$. As $x \in m - C$ and $x \neq m$, there exists c^* such that

$$c^* \in C \setminus \{0\} \text{ and } x = m - c^*. \quad (35)$$

By part 1 of Lemma 3, from (30) and (34) we infer that $x \in \mathcal{M}(R, B_{f,X}^w)$: Corollary 6 and Lemma 9 then imply

$$f(x) = w. \quad (36)$$

The membership in (31) implies $m \in B_{f,X}^w$ and hence

$$f(m) \leq w. \quad (37)$$

As $f \in P_X$ and $C \subseteq X$, from (35) we infer that $f(c^*) > 0$ and $f(x) = f(m) - f(c^*)$: then (37) implies $f(x) < w$ in contradiction with (36). ■

References

- [1] C. Aliprantis and K. Border. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, third edition, 2006.
- [2] R. Boç, E. Csetnek, and G. Wanka. Regularity conditions via quasi-relative interior in convex programming. *SIAM J Optim*, 19:217–233, 2008.
- [3] J.-M. Bonnisseau. The marginal pricing rule in economies with infinitely many commodities. *Positivity*, 6:275–296, 2002.
- [4] J.-M. Bonnisseau and B. Cornet. Valuation equilibrium and Pareto optimum in non-convex economies. *J Math Econ*, 17:293–308, 1988.
- [5] K. C. Border. *Fixed Point Theorems with Applications to Economics and Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [6] J. M. Borwein and A. S. Lewis. Partially finite convex programming, part i: Quasi relative interiors and duality theory. *Math Program*, 57:15–48, 1992.
- [7] F. Cammaroto and B. D. Bella. Separation theorem based on the quasirelative interior and application to duality theory. *J Optim Theory Appl*, 125:223–229, 2005.
- [8] M. C. Ceparano and F. Quartieri. Nash equilibrium uniqueness in nice games with isotone best replies. *J Math Econ*, 70:154–165, 2017.
- [9] M. C. Ceparano and F. Quartieri. A second welfare theorem in a non-convex economy: The case of antichain-convexity. *J Math Econ*, 81:31–47, 2019.
- [10] P. Daniele, S. Giuffr, G. Idone, and A. Maugeri. Infinite dimensional duality and applications. *Math Ann*, pages 221–239, 2007.
- [11] I. Ekeland and R. Témam. *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*. SIAM, 1999.
- [12] S. Flåm and A. Jourani. Prices and pareto optima. *Optim*, 55:611–625, 2006.
- [13] M. Florenzano, P. Gourdel, and A. Jofré. Supporting weakly Pareto optimal allocations in infinite dimensional nonconvex economies. *Econ Theory*, 29:549–564, 2006.
- [14] F. Flores-Bazán and G. Mastroeni. Strong duality in cone constrained nonconvex optimization. *SIAM J Optim*, 23:153–169, 2013.
- [15] R. Guesnerie. Pareto optimality in non-convex economies. *Econometrica*, 43:1–29, 1975.

- [16] A. Habte and B. S. Mordukhovich. Extended second welfare theorem for nonconvex economies with infinite commodities and public goods. In S. Kusuoka and T. Maruyama, editors, *Advances in Mathematical Economics*, pages 93–126, Tokyo, 2011.
- [17] A. Jofré and A. Jourani. Characterizations of the free disposal condition for nonconvex economies on infinite dimensional commodity spaces. *SIAM J. Optim*, 25:699–712, 2015.
- [18] A. Jofré and J. Rivera. A nonconvex separation property and some applications. *Math Program*, 108:37–51, 2006.
- [19] J. L. Kelley and I. Namioka. *Linear Topological Spaces*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1963.
- [20] M. A. Khan. The Mordukhovich normal cone and the foundations of welfare economics. *J Pub Econ Theory*, 1:309–338, 1999.
- [21] M. A. Khan and R. Vohra. An extension of the second welfare theorem to economies with nonconvexities and public goods. *Q J Econ*, 102:223–241, 1987.
- [22] M. A. Khan and R. Vohra. Pareto optimal allocations of nonconvex economies in locally convex spaces. *Nonlinear Anal Theory Methods Appl*, 12:943–950, 1988.
- [23] A. Mas-Colell, M. D. Whinston, and J. R. Green. *Microeconomic Theory*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- [24] B. S. Mordukhovich. An abstract extremal principle with applications to welfare economics. *J Math Anal Appl*, 251:187–216, 2000.
- [25] B. S. Mordukhovich. *Variational Analysis and Applications*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [26] I. A. Polyrakis. Demand functions and reflexivity. *J Math Anal Appl*, 338:695–704, 2008.
- [27] R. M. Starr. Quasi-equilibria in markets with non-convex preferences. *Econometrica*, 37:25–38, 1969.
- [28] D. Van Cuong, B. S. Mordukhovich, and N. M. Nam. Quasi-relative interiors for graphs of convex set-valued mappings. *Optim Lett*, 2019.
- [29] C. Zălinescu. *Convex Analysis in General Vector Spaces*. World Scientific, 2002.
- [30] C. Zălinescu. On the use of the quasi-relative interior in optimization. *Optim*, 64:1795–1823, 2015.