

# A non-convex relaxed version of minimax theorems\*

M.I.A. Ghitri<sup>†</sup>, A. Hantoute<sup>‡</sup>

Department of Mathematics, University of Alicante, Spain

## Abstract

Given a subset  $A \times B$  of a locally convex space  $X \times Y$  (with  $A$  compact) and a function  $f : A \times B \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  such that  $f(\cdot, y)$ ,  $y \in B$ , are concave and upper semi-continuous, the minimax inequality  $\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} f(x, y) \geq \inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y)$  is shown to hold provided that  $A_0$  be the set of  $x \in A$  such that  $f(x, \cdot)$  is proper, convex and lower semi-continuous. Moreover, if in addition  $A \times B \subset f^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$ , then we can take as  $A_0$  the set of  $x \in A$  such that  $f(x, \cdot)$  is convex. The relation to Moreau's biconjugate representation theorem is discussed, and some applications to convex duality are provided.

**Key words.** Minimax theorem, Moreau theorem, conjugate function, convex optimization.

*Mathematics Subject Classification (2010):* 26B05, 26J25, 49H05.

## 1 Introduction

Given a function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , defined on the Cartesian product of a locally convex space  $X$  and a linear space  $Y$ , and two convex sets  $A \subset X$ ,  $B \subset Y$ , an enough general minimax theorem ([5]) ensures that  $\inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A} f(x, y) = \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} f(x, y)$  or, equivalently,

$$\inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A} f(x, y) \leq \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} f(x, y). \quad (1)$$

Standard requirements for the validity of this minimax equality are the compactness of the convex set  $A$ , the concavity and upper semicontinuity of the functions  $f(\cdot, y)$  when  $y$  ranges the whole set  $B$ , together with the following conditions,

$$A \times B \subset f^{-1}(\mathbb{R}), \text{ and } f(x, \cdot) \text{ is convex for all } x \in A. \quad (2)$$

First versions of the minimax theorem date back to [19] and since then, has not ceased to be improved. Several interesting generalizations of the above theory have been proposed,

---

\*Research supported by MICIU of Spain and Universidad de Alicante (Contract Beatriz Galindo BEA-GAL 18/00205), Research Projects PGC2018-097960-B-C21 from MICINN of Spain and AICO/2021/165 of Generalitat Valenciana.

<sup>†</sup>e-mail: moghitri@gmail.com

<sup>‡</sup>e-mail: hantoute@us.es (corresponding author)

either by relaxing the underlying linear structure or convexity/concavity assumptions. We refer to [26, 27] for an exhaustive presentation of many variants and extensions of this theorem. In this paper, we are concerned with the following two questions dealing with the possible relaxation of the two conditions in (2), which to the best of our knowledge have not been considered before.

(1) Firstly, can the hypothesis on the finiteness of the function  $f$ ,  $A \times B \subset f^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$ , be removed? Clearly, avoiding this restrictive condition would widen the applicability of the theorem above to large families of functions. For instance, to all convex/concave functions taking infinite  $(+\infty/-\infty)$  values, which are of frequent use in convex optimization and elsewhere.

(2) Does the inequality in (1) remain true if the functions  $f(x, \cdot)$  are not convex for all  $x \in A$  but, instead, only on a subset of  $A$ ? In other words, does (1) hold if  $A$  is replaced with the set  $A_0 := \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) \text{ convex}\}$ ?

To answer these two questions, we propose in this paper two relaxed variants of the above minimax (inequality) theorem. For any given function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  such that  $f(\cdot, y)$  are concave and upper semicontinuous, for all  $y \in B$ , and non-empty convex sets  $A \subset X$ ,  $B \subset Y$ , with  $A$  being compact, we establish the following two results.

**Theorem (see Theorem 7)** If  $A_0 := \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)\}$ , then

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y) \leq \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y).$$

**Theorem (see Theorem 9)** If  $A \times B \subset f^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $A_1 := \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) \text{ is convex}\}$ , then

$$\inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A_1} f(x, y) \leq \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} f(x, y).$$

The proofs of these two results are new, and are based on the Moreau representation theorem of the biconjugate function ([16]), which is itself a kind of a minimax theorem. The relationship between the minimax theorem and the mentioned Moreau theorem had already been recognized ([15, 21]), and in this paper we prove that they are indeed equivalent.

The above minimax theorems are of frequent use in optimization and convex duality, we refer to [4, 7, 9, 12, 13] and references therein for applications to subdifferential calculus of the supremum functions. For the sake of motivation, we give the following example (see Example 1 and Corollary 11 for the details).

**Example:** Given a finite family of lower semicontinuous convex functions  $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k\}$  and  $\varphi := \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \varphi_i$ , we consider the optimization problem

$$\inf_{x \in X} \varphi(x) \left( = \inf_{x \in X} \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_k} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \varphi_i(x) \right),$$

where  $\Delta_k$  is the  $k$ -simplex. If all the  $\varphi_i$ 's are proper (i.e., they do not take the value  $-\infty$ ), then we can apply the standard minimax theorem (1) to the function  $f(\lambda, x) :=$

$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \varphi_i(x)$  and the sets  $A := \Delta_k$ ,  $B = \text{dom } \varphi$  (the effective domain of  $\varphi$ ) to ensure that

$$\inf_{x \in X} \varphi(x) = \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_k} \inf_{x \in X} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \varphi_i(x) \quad (3)$$

Otherwise, if the  $\varphi_i$ 's are not all proper, the function  $f$  can take the value  $-\infty$ , and (1) could not be applied, at least directly. However, we can use the first theorem above (Theorem 7), appealing to the set  $A_0 := \{\lambda \in \Delta_k : \lambda_i > 0 \text{ for all } i\}$  (observe that  $0f_i$  is the indicator function of  $\text{dom } f_i$ , and this function is not necessarily lower semicontinuous). Then we obtain

$$\inf_{x \in X} \max_{\lambda \in A_0} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \varphi_i(x) \leq \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_k} \inf_{x \in X} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \varphi_i(x),$$

and (3) again follows as  $\max_{\lambda \in A_0} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \varphi_i(x) = \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_k} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \lambda_i \varphi_i(x)$ .

Many developments have been made recently in the topic of minimax theorems, which could also be considered in our case for further developments. We refer, for instance, to [3] for extensions to abstract convex functions, to [6] for relaxed convexity conditions using partial data, to [10, 24] for application to alternative theorems, to [20] and [25] for new topological minimax theorems. Other extensions are given in [11], [17] and [28] among other achievements.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the main notations and results that are needed in the sequel. Section 3 reviews some topological minimax theorems. The extended real-valued version of the minimax theorem, Theorem 7, is given in section 4, whereas the second variant given in Theorem 9, is given in section 5.

## 2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper,  $X$  stands for a real (separated) locally convex spaces (lcs, for short). The pairing between  $X$  and its topological dual  $X^*$  is denoted by  $(x^*, x) \in X^* \times X \mapsto \langle x^*, x \rangle := \langle x, x^* \rangle := x^*(x)$ . The zero vector is denoted by  $\theta$ , and the family of closed convex balanced neighborhoods of  $\theta$ , called  $\theta$ -neighborhoods, is denoted  $\mathcal{N}_X$ . We use the notation  $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$  and  $\mathbb{R}_\infty := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , and adopt the conventions  $(+\infty) + (-\infty) = (-\infty) + (+\infty) = +\infty$ ,  $0 \cdot (+\infty) = +\infty$ , and  $0 \cdot (-\infty) = 0$ .

Given a set  $A \subset X$ , by  $\text{co } A$  we denote the convex hull of the set  $A$ , while  $\text{cl } A$  (and sometimes  $\overline{A}$ ) is used for denoting the closure of  $A$ ; in particular,  $\overline{\text{co } A} := \text{cl}(\text{co } A)$ . The polar set of  $A$  is  $A^\circ := \{x^* \in X^* : \langle x^*, x \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all } x \in A\}$ . The indicator function of  $A$  is the function  $I_A : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$  defined by  $I_A(x) := 0$  if  $x \in A$ , and  $I_A(x) := +\infty$  otherwise.

Given a function  $f : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , by  $\text{dom } f := \{x \in X : f(x) < +\infty\}$  and  $\text{epi } f := \{(x, \lambda) \in X \times \mathbb{R} : f(x) \leq \lambda\}$ , we denote the (effective) domain and epigraph of  $f$ , respectively. We say that  $f$  is proper if  $\text{dom } f \neq \emptyset$  and  $f(x) > -\infty$  for all  $x \in X$ , lower semicontinuous (lsc, for short) if  $\text{epi } f$  is closed, and convex if  $\text{epi } f$  is convex. The closed and the closed convex hulls of  $f$  are, respectively, the functions  $\text{cl } f$  (or  $\bar{f}$ ) and

$\overline{\text{co}}f$  satisfying  $\text{epi } \bar{f} = \text{cl}(\text{epi } f)$  and  $\text{epi}(\overline{\text{co}}f) = \overline{\text{co}}(\text{epi } f)$ . We shall denote by  $\Gamma_0(X)$  the family of proper, convex and lsc functions defined on  $X$ . It is known that a lsc convex function which takes somewhere the value  $-\infty$ , it can only take infinite values ( $+\infty$  and  $-\infty$ ).

The conjugate of  $f$  is the lsc convex function  $f^* : X^* \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  defined by

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

The function  $f^*$  is proper if and only if  $f$  is, provided that  $f$  is lsc and convex. Moreover, due to the relations

$$\inf f = \inf(\text{cl } f) = \inf(\text{co } f) = \inf(\overline{\text{co}}f), \quad (4)$$

the function  $f^*$  does not distinguish between the function and its convex hulls; that is,

$$f^* = (\text{co } f)^* = (\overline{\text{co}}f)^*. \quad (5)$$

Moreover, due to Moreau's theorem ([29]), provided that  $\overline{\text{co}}f$  is proper we have

$$f^{**} = \overline{\text{co}}f, \quad (6)$$

where  $f^{**} : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  stands for (the restriction to  $X$  of) the conjugate of  $f^*$ . The conjugation operation obeys many nice calculus rules; for instance, given a family of functions  $f_t : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $t \in T$ , the following relation always holds

$$\left( \inf_{t \in T} f_t \right)^* = \sup_{t \in T} f_t^*, \quad (7)$$

whereas (6) gives rise to

$$\left( \sup_{t \in T} f_t \right)^* = \overline{\text{co}} \left( \inf_{t \in T} f_t^* \right); \quad (8)$$

the latter being true when  $f_t$  and  $\sup_{t \in T} f_t \in \Gamma_0(X)$ . A related concept is the  $\varepsilon$ -subdifferential of  $f$ ,  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ , given by

$$\partial_\varepsilon f(x) := \{x^* \in X^* : f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle x^*, y - x \rangle - \varepsilon, \text{ for all } y \in X\},$$

with  $\partial_\varepsilon f(x) := \emptyset$  if  $x \notin \text{dom } f$  or  $\varepsilon < 0$ . The set  $\partial f(x) := \partial_0 f(x)$  is the subdifferential of  $f$  at  $x$ .

We recall the following known fact that will be used later (see [8]): If  $\{f_t : t \in T\}$  is a non-empty family of convex functions, and  $f := \sup_{t \in T} f_t$ , are such that  $\text{aff}(\text{dom } f_t) = \text{aff}(\text{dom } f)$ , for all  $t \in T$ , and  $f|_{\text{aff}(\text{dom } f)}$  is finite and continuous somewhere in  $\text{ri}(\text{dom } f)$ , then we have

$$\text{cl } f = \sup_{t \in T} \text{cl } f_t. \quad (9)$$

### 3 A topological minimax theorem

The present section provides topologically flavored minimax-type results that illustrate the essential arguments underlying the proof of minimax theorems, namely, the utility of compactness and monotonicity-like properties with respect to one of the variables. The results of this section will also be used later.

The first proposition analyzes the interchange between the lower limit and the minimum up to some appropriate lsc regularizations. This result can be obtained from [23, Propostition 7.29] but, for the sake of completeness, a short proof is given here with a slight improvement of the underlying upper semi-continuity assumption. Throughout this section,  $X$  stands for a topological space.

**Proposition 1** *Let  $(\varphi_i)_{i \in I}$  be a net of extended real-valued functions defined on a topological space  $X$ . For any nonempty compact set  $A \subset X$ , we have*

$$\min_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \text{cl} \left( \inf_{i \preceq j} \varphi_j + \mathbb{I}_A \right) (x) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in A, i \preceq j} \varphi_j(x). \quad (10)$$

**Proof.** We denote  $\psi_i := \text{cl}(\inf_{i \preceq j} \varphi_j + \mathbb{I}_A)$ ,  $i \in I$ , so that each  $\psi_i$  is lsc, obviously, and  $(\psi_i)_{i \in I}$  forms a non-decreasing net. Then, taking into account the compactness of  $A$ , we pick a net  $(x_i)_i \subset A$  such that  $\psi_i(x_i) = \min_{x \in A} \psi_i(x)$ , for each  $i \in I$ , and  $x_i \rightarrow \bar{x} \in A$  without loss of generality (w.l.o.g. for short) on  $I$ . Thus, for each given  $j \in I$ , we have  $\psi_j(\bar{x}) \leq \liminf_{i \in I} \psi_j(x_i)$  and, so,

$$\psi_j(\bar{x}) \leq \liminf_{i \in I} \psi_j(x_i) \leq \liminf_{i \in I} \psi_i(x_i) = \liminf_{i \in I} \min_{x \in A} \psi_i(x).$$

Consequently, since the last inequality holds for all  $j \in I$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \psi_i(x) &= \min_{x \in A} \lim_{i \in I} \psi_i(x) \leq \lim_{i \in I} \psi_i(\bar{x}) = \sup_{i \in I} \min_{x \in A} \psi_i(x) \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in A} \left( \inf_{i \preceq j} \varphi_j + \mathbb{I}_A \right) (x) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in A, i \preceq j} \varphi_j(x), \end{aligned}$$

and relation (10) follows as

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in A, i \preceq j} \varphi_j(x) &= \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in X} \left( \inf_{i \preceq j} \varphi_j + \mathbb{I}_A \right) (x) \\ &= \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in X} \text{cl} \left( \inf_{i \preceq j} \varphi_j + \mathbb{I}_A \right) (x) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in X} \psi_i(x) \leq \min_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \psi_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

■

Next, we discuss some situations in which (10) simplifies to the minimax relation  $\sup_{i \in I} \min_{x \in A} \varphi_i(x) = \min_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \varphi_i(x)$ ; the validity of the latter in general is discarded (see, e.g., [23, page 239]). A first consequence of Proposition 1 concerns non-

decreasing nets  $(\varphi_i)_{i \in I}$ ; that is,

$$i_1 \preceq i_2 \Rightarrow \varphi_{i_1} \leq \varphi_{i_2} \quad \text{for all } i_1, i_2 \in I,$$

where “ $\preceq$ ” stands for the partial order relation directing the index set  $I$ .

**Corollary 2** *Assume that the net  $(\varphi_i)_{i \in I}$  in Proposition 1 is non-decreasing. Then we have that*

$$\min_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \text{cl}(\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A)(x) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in A} \varphi_i(x), \quad (11)$$

and consequently, provided that the  $\varphi_i$ 's are lsc,

$$\min_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \varphi_i(x) = \sup_{i \in I} \min_{x \in A} \varphi_i(x).$$

**Proof.** Under the current assumption, each of the functions  $\inf_{i \preceq j} \varphi_j (= \varphi_j)$ ,  $i \in I$ , is lsc and (10) straightforwardly gives rise to (11). ■

Convexity would make it possible to avoid the lower semi-continuity assumption used in the previous corollary; as for the property of monotonicity, we must await the following sections.

**Corollary 3** *Let  $(\varphi_i)_{i \in I}$  be a non-decreasing net of extended real-valued proper convex functions defined on a lcs space  $X$ , and let  $A \subset X$  be a nonempty compact convex set. We assume that the function  $\varphi := \sup_{i \in I} \varphi_i$  is finite and continuous at some point in  $\text{int}(A)$ , assumed nonempty. Then we have that*

$$\inf_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \varphi_i(x) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in A} \varphi_i(x),$$

**Proof.** The current convexity and continuity/interiority assumptions guarantee, according to [8, Corollary 9 and Lemma 15], that  $\sup_{i \in I} (\text{cl}(\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A)) = \text{cl}(\sup_{i \in I} (\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A))$  and  $\text{cl}(\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A) = (\text{cl} \varphi_i) + \mathbf{I}_A$ , for all  $i \in I$ . So,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \text{cl}(\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A)(x) &= \min_{x \in X} \sup_{i \in I} (\text{cl}(\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A))(x) \\ &= \min_{x \in X} \text{cl} \left( \sup_{i \in I} (\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A) \right) (x) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{i \in I} (\varphi_i + \mathbf{I}_A)(x) = \inf_{x \in A} \sup_{i \in I} \varphi_i(x), \end{aligned}$$

and the desired conclusion follows from (11). ■

One possible way to overcome the compactness assumption used above is to compactify the given set  $A$  and, consequently, use appropriate lsc regularization of the  $\varphi_i$ 's. For this purpose, given a topological space  $X$ , we consider the Stone-Ćech compactification  $\beta(X)$  of  $X$  defined as the closure of  $X$  in the (Hausdorff) compact product topological space

$$T := [0, 1]^{\mathcal{C}(X, [0, 1])} \equiv \{\gamma : \mathcal{C}(X, [0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, 1]\},$$

where  $\mathcal{C}(X, [0, 1])$  denotes the set of continuous functions from  $X$  to  $[0, 1]$  (we refer to [18] for more details on this compactification process). Indeed,  $X$  is identified with a subset of  $T$  thanks to the mapping  $\mathfrak{w} : X \rightarrow T$  defined as  $\mathfrak{w}(x) \equiv \gamma_x$ , where

$$\gamma_x(\varphi) := \varphi(x) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{C}(X, [0, 1]), \quad (12)$$

allowing us to set  $X \equiv \mathfrak{w}(X)$ . Recall that the convergence of a given net  $(\gamma_j)_j$  to  $\gamma$  in  $T$ , written  $\gamma_j \rightarrow \gamma$ , means that

$$\gamma_j(\varphi) \rightarrow \gamma(\varphi) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{C}(X, [0, 1]). \quad (13)$$

When  $X$  is a Tychonoff space (i.e., completely regular and Hausdorff ([18])),  $\beta(X)$  is a Hausdorff space and the mapping  $\mathfrak{w}$  is a homeomorphism between  $X$  and  $\mathfrak{w}(X)$ ; that is,

$$\gamma_{x_j} \rightarrow \gamma_x \text{ if and only if } x_j \rightarrow x \text{ in } X, \quad (14)$$

for every  $x \in X$  and every net  $(x_j)_j \subset X$ .

**Corollary 4** *Let  $(\varphi_i)_{i \in I}$  be a non-decreasing net of extended real-valued functions defined on a topological space  $X$ . Then we have that*

$$\min_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{i \in I} (\text{cl } \varphi_i)(\gamma) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in X} \varphi_i(x),$$

where  $\beta(X)$  stands for the Stone-Ćech compactification of  $X$  and  $\text{cl } \varphi_i : \beta(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $i \in I$ , are defined by

$$(\text{cl } \varphi_i)(\gamma) := \liminf_{\gamma_{x_j} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_j)_j \subset X} \varphi_i(x_j).$$

**Proof.** We apply Corollary 2 to the non-decreasing net  $(\psi_i)_{i \in I}$  of extended real-valued functions defined on the topological space  $\beta(X)$  as

$$\psi_i(\gamma) := \begin{cases} \varphi_i(x), & \text{if } \gamma = \gamma_x, x \in X, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

hence, the closure of each  $\psi_i$  with respect to the new topology on  $\beta(X)$  satisfies

$$(\text{cl } \psi_i)(\gamma) = \liminf_{\gamma_{x_j} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_j)_j \subset X} \varphi_i(x_j) = (\text{cl } \varphi_i)(\gamma).$$

Consequently, since  $\beta(X)$  is compact by construction, Corollary 2 yields

$$\min_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{i \in I} (\text{cl } \varphi_i)(\gamma) = \min_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{i \in I} (\text{cl } \psi_i)(\gamma) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \psi_i(\gamma) = \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{x \in X} \varphi_i(x).$$

■

Corollary 4 is illustrated in the following result, presented as an example, which will be used later when deriving the Moreau biconjugate representation theorem from the

minimax theorem. Note that although we have used here the process of compactification, the final minimax equality is expressed only using the original space  $X$ .

**Example 1** *Let  $X$  be a lcs space,  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ , and  $x_0 \in X$ . Then we have (the minimax inequality)*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \inf_{x \in X} \left( \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \{ \langle x^*, x_0 - x \rangle + f(x) \} \right) &= \min_{x \in X} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \left( \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \{ \langle x^*, x_0 - x \rangle + f(x) \} \right) \\ & (= f(x_0)). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

**Proof.** We introduce the functions  $\varphi_U : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{N}_X$ , given by

$$\varphi_U(x) := \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \{ \langle x^*, x_0 - x \rangle + f(x) \},$$

and endow the family  $\mathcal{N}_X$  of  $\theta$ -neighborhoods in  $X$  with the partial order given by descending inclusions; that is,

$$U_1 \preceq U_2, \quad U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{N}_X \Leftrightarrow U_2 \subset U_1,$$

so that the net  $(\varphi_U)_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X}$  is non-decreasing. Moreover, since each set  $U^\circ$  is  $w^*$ -compact by Dieudonné's Theorem (see, e.g., [29, Theorem 1.1.8]), we have that  $\emptyset \neq \text{dom } f \subset \text{dom } \varphi_U$  and, so,  $\varphi_U \in \Gamma_0(X)$ . Therefore, by Corollary 4,

$$\min_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \inf_{x \in X} \varphi_U(x), \tag{16}$$

where  $\beta(X)$  stands for the Stone-Čech compactification of the lcs  $X$  and the function  $\text{cl } \varphi_U : \beta(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{N}_X$ , is defined as

$$(\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) := \liminf_{\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_i)_i \subset X} \varphi_U(x_i).$$

In particular, since  $X$  is completely regular (as  $X$  is an (Hausdorff) lcs),  $\beta(X)$  is Hausdorff and the lower semicontinuity of each  $\varphi_U$  yields, for every  $x \in X$ ,

$$(\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma_x) = \liminf_{\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma_x, (x_i)_i \subset X} \varphi_U(x_i) = \varphi_U(x). \tag{17}$$

Let us show that

$$\min_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \varphi_U(x_0) = f(x_0).$$

Indeed, if  $\gamma \in \beta(X) \setminus \{\gamma_{x_0}\}$ , then (14) together with the fact that  $\beta(X)$  is Hausdorff gives rise to some  $V \in \mathcal{N}_X$  such that  $x_0 - x_i \in X \setminus V$  frequently for  $i$ , for all nets  $(x_i)_i \subset X$  such that  $\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma$ . Hence, by the bipolar theorem ([29, Theorem 1.1.9]),



there exists some  $x_0^* \in V^\circ$  such that  $\langle x_0^*, x_0 - x_i \rangle > 1$  frequently for  $i$  (for all nets  $(x_i)_i \subset X$  such that  $\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma$ ). Thus, using the lower semicontinuity of the function  $x \mapsto \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \{\langle x^*, x_0 - x \rangle + f(x)\}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) &= \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \liminf_{\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_i)_i \subset X} \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \{\langle x^*, x_0 - x_i \rangle + f(x_i)\} \\ &\geq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \liminf_{\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_i)_i \subset X} (\langle x^*, x_0 - x_i \rangle + f(x_i)), \end{aligned}$$

At the same time, since  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ , there are  $a_0^* \in X^*$  and  $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f \geq \langle a_0^*, \cdot \rangle + \alpha_0$  ([29, Theorem 2.2.6]), and the last inequality above simplifies to

$$\sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) \geq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \liminf_{\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_i)_i \subset X} \langle x^* - a_0^*, x_0 - x_i \rangle + (\langle a_0^*, x_0 \rangle + \alpha_0).$$

Now, given any  $m \geq 1$ , we have  $m^{-1}V \in \mathcal{N}_X$  and  $mx_0^* \in mV^\circ = (m^{-1}V)^\circ$ . So, choosing  $U$  small enough such that  $a_0^* + mV^\circ \subset U^\circ$ , we obtain  $a_0^* + mx_0^* \in U^\circ$  and the last inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) &\geq \sup_{x^* \in a_0^* + mV^\circ} \liminf_{\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_i)_i \subset X} \langle x^* - a_0^*, x_0 - x_i \rangle + (\langle a_0^*, x_0 \rangle + \alpha_0) \\ &\geq \liminf_{\gamma_{x_i} \rightarrow \gamma, (x_i)_i \subset X} \langle mx_0^*, x_0 - x_i \rangle + (\langle a_0^*, x_0 \rangle + \alpha_0) \\ &\geq m + (\langle a_0^*, x_0 \rangle + \alpha_0). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, by the arbitrariness of  $m \geq 1$ , we have that  $\sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) = +\infty$ , and the infimum in  $\inf_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma)$  is attained at  $\gamma = \gamma_{x_0}$ . Consequently, by combining (16) and (17) we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \inf_{x \in X} \varphi_U(x) &= \min_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma) = \min_{\gamma \in \beta(X)} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} (\text{cl } \varphi_U)(\gamma_x) \\ &= \min_{x \in X} \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \varphi_U(x) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \varphi_U(x_0) = f(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

■

At this step, the objective of the next section will be to remove the non-decreasingness condition used in the previous results.

## 4 Extended real-valued minimax theorem

We give in this section a minimax theorem for extended real-valued bifunctions defined on the Cartesian product  $X \times Y$ , for lcs  $X$  and  $Y$ .

We will need some technical lemmas related to the continuity of convex marginal functions.

**Lemma 5** *Given a lsc convex function  $F : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and a nonempty compact convex*

set  $A \subset X$ , the function  $g : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$  defined by

$$g(y) := \inf_{x \in A} F(x, y)$$

is convex and lsc.

**Proof.** The convexity of  $g$  is well-known as it is the marginal of the convex function  $F + \mathbb{I}_{A \times Y}$  (see, e.g., [29, Theorem 2.1.3(v)]). To check that it is also lsc, we fix  $\bar{y} \in Y$  and take an arbitrary net  $(y_i)_i \subset Y$  that converges to  $\bar{y}$ . We may assume that  $(y_i)_i \subset \text{dom } g$ ; otherwise,  $g(y_i) = +\infty$  frequently for  $i \in I$ , and the inequality  $g(\bar{y}) \leq \liminf_i g(y_i)$  obviously holds. We also take nets  $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}, (k_i)_{i \in I} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\alpha_i \downarrow 0$  and  $k_i \uparrow +\infty$ . Then we find another net  $(x_i)_{i \in I} \subset A$  such that

$$F(x_i, y_i) \leq \max\{g(y_i), -k_i\} + \alpha_i, \text{ for all } i \in I. \quad (18)$$

Moreover, taking into account the compactness of  $A$ , we may assume that  $(x_i)_i$  converges to some  $\bar{x} \in A$  (w.o.l.g. on  $I$ ). Thus, taking limits in (18), the lower semicontinuity of  $F$  gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) &\leq \liminf_i F(x_i, y_i) \leq \liminf_i (\max\{g(y_i), -k_i\} + \alpha_i) \\ &= \liminf_i \max\{g(y_i), -k_i\} = \liminf_i g(y_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since  $\bar{x} \in A$ , we obtain  $g(\bar{y}) \leq F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leq \liminf_i g(y_i)$  and the lower semicontinuity of  $g$  at  $\bar{y}$  follows. ■

We apply the previous lemma to a special case that interests us.

**Lemma 6** Consider a function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and a nonempty compact convex set  $A \subset X$ . If  $f(\cdot, y)$  is concave and usc, for each  $y \in Y$ , then the function  $g : Y^* \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  defined by

$$g(y^*) := \inf_{x \in A} (f(x, \cdot))^*(y^*) \quad (19)$$

is convex and lsc.

**Proof.** Firstly, for each  $y \in Y$ , the function  $(x, y^*) \in X \times Y^* \mapsto \langle y, y^* \rangle - f(x, y)$  is convex and lsc, and so is the pointwise supremum  $F(x, y^*) := \sup_{y \in Y} \{\langle y, y^* \rangle - f(x, y)\} = (f(x, \cdot))^*(y^*)$ . The conclusion follows then from Lemma 5. ■

We give the main minimax result of this section for extended real-valued functions.

**Theorem 7** Given a function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and a nonempty convex set  $A \subset X$ , we suppose the following conditions:

- (i) The set  $A$  is compact.
- (ii) The functions  $f(\cdot, y), y \in Y$ , are concave and usc.

Then we have

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y) \leq \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y), \quad (20)$$

where

$$A_0 := \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)\}. \quad (21)$$

**Proof.** First, let us observe that the function  $\inf_{y \in Y} f(\cdot, y)$  is concave and usc, so that  $\sup_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y)$ ; that is, the supremum is attained. The inequality in (20) obviously holds whenever  $A_0 = \emptyset$ , because in that case we would have  $\sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y) = -\infty$  for all  $y \in Y$ . Let us also check that (20) holds when  $A_0 \neq \emptyset$  and

$$\sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y) = +\infty \text{ for all } y \in Y.$$

Indeed, in such a case, since  $A_0 \subset A$  we would have that  $\sup_{x \in A} f(x, y) = +\infty$  for all  $y \in Y$ . Thus, for each given  $y \in Y$ , conditions (i)-(ii) yield an element  $x(y) \in A$  such that  $f(x(y), y) = +\infty$ . In particular, the usc concave function  $f(\cdot, y)$  is not proper; thus, it only takes the infinite values  $+\infty$  and  $-\infty$ . But, from the definition of the set  $A_0$  (assumed nonempty), all the function  $f(x, \cdot)$  for  $x \in A_0$  are proper, and so  $f(x, y) = +\infty$  for all  $x \in A_0$  and  $y \in Y$ . Consequently,

$$\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \sup_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \geq \sup_{x \in A_0} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = +\infty = \inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y),$$

and (20) holds in the current case too.

On account of the comments above, it suffices to prove (20) under the assumption that  $A_0 \neq \emptyset$  and there exists some  $y_0 \in Y$  satisfying

$$\sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y_0) < +\infty. \quad (22)$$

Then, using the definition of the conjugate, we write

$$\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \max_{x \in A} (-(f(x, \cdot))^*(\theta)) = -\min_{x \in A} (f(x, \cdot))^*(\theta), \quad (23)$$

and Lemma 6 together with the fact that  $A_0 \subset A$  yields

$$\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = -\overline{\text{co}} \left( \inf_{x \in A} (f(x, \cdot))^* \right) (\theta) \geq -\overline{\text{co}} \left( \inf_{x \in A_0} (f(x, \cdot))^* \right) (\theta).$$

Therefore, since  $f(x, \cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)$  for all  $x \in A_0$ , and  $\sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, \cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)$  by (22), relation (8) implies that

$$\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \geq - \left( \sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, \cdot) \right)^* (\theta) = \inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y),$$

which is the desired inequality. ■

If, in addition, the set  $A$  defined in (21) is such that

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in A} f(x, y) \geq \inf_{y \in Y} \max_{x \in A} f(x, y), \quad (24)$$

then Theorem 7 implies the minimax equality

$$\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \inf_{y \in Y} \max_{x \in A} f(x, y).$$

In this line we have the following example where the convexity of  $f(x, \cdot)$  is only required to hold for points  $x \in \text{int}(A)$ . A finite-dimensional version of this result is also possible, up to replacing the interior with the relative interior.

**Example 2** Given a function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and a nonempty convex set  $A \subset X$ , we assume the following conditions:

- (i) The set  $A$  is compact.
- (ii) The functions  $f(\cdot, y)$ ,  $y \in Y$ , are concave and usc.
- (iii)  $(\text{int}(A)) \cap \{x \in X : f(x, y) > -\infty\} \neq \emptyset$  for all  $y \in Y$ .
- (iv)  $f(x, \cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)$  for all  $x \in \text{int}(A)$ .

Then we have the minimax equality :

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \max_{x \in A} f(x, y) = \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y).$$

Indeed, on the one hand, condition (iii) and the accessibility lemma (e.g., [8, Lemma 1]) ensure that

$$\sup_{x \in \text{int} A} f(x, y) = \sup_{x \in A} f(x, y) \text{ for all } y \in Y;$$

that is,

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \max_{x \in A} f(x, y) = \inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in \text{int} A} f(x, y).$$

But (iv) implies that  $\text{int}(A) \subset A_0 = \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)\} \subset A$ , and so Theorem 7 yields

$$\inf_{y \in Y} \max_{x \in A} f(x, y) = \inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in \text{int} A} f(x, y) \leq \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} f(x, y) \leq \inf_{y \in Y} \max_{x \in A} f(x, y),$$

proving the desired minimax equality.

A localized version of Theorem 7 is given in the corollary below. Its proof is immediate by applying this theorem to the new bifunction

$$(x, y) \mapsto \tilde{f}(x, y) := f(x, y) + I_B(y),$$

which is easily shown to satisfy conditions (i)-(ii) of Theorem 7, and to the set

$$\tilde{A}_0 := \{x \in A : \tilde{f}(x, \cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)\} = \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) + I_B(\cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)\}. \quad (25)$$

Note that here the convexity of the given set  $B$  is implicit, because the nonemptiness of the set  $\tilde{A}_0$  guarantees the convexity of  $B \cap \text{dom} f(x, \cdot)$  for all  $x \in \tilde{A}_0$ .

**Corollary 8** Given a function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and nonempty sets  $A \subset X$ ,  $B \subset Y$ , we assume the following conditions:

- (i) The set  $A$  is convex and compact.
- (ii) The functions  $f(\cdot, y)$ ,  $y \in B$ , are concave and usc.

Then we have

$$\inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A_0} f(x, y) \leq \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} f(x, y), \quad (26)$$

where  $A_0 := \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_B(\cdot) \in \Gamma_0(Y)\}$ .

## 5 Minimax theorem

We give another variant of the minimax theorem, dropping out the lower semicontinuity condition of the functions  $f(x, \cdot)$ ,  $x \in A$ , used in Theorem 7. Instead, we use here the condition that the function  $f$  is finite-valued on the set  $A \times B$ . As in the previous section, we also assume here that  $X$  and  $Y$  are two lcs.

**Theorem 9** Given a function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  and nonempty convex sets  $A \subset X$ ,  $B \subset Y$  such that  $A \times B \subset f^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$ , we assume the following conditions:

- (i) The set  $A$  is compact.
- (ii) The functions  $f(\cdot, y)$ ,  $y \in B$ , are concave and usc.

Then, we have

$$\inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A_1} f(x, y) \leq \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} f(x, y),$$

where

$$A_1 := \{x \in A : f(x, \cdot) \text{ is convex}\}.$$

**Proof.** First, note that the relation  $A \times B \subset f^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$  together with condition (ii) entails

$$\sup_{x \in A} f(x, y) = \max_{x \in A} f(x, y) < +\infty \text{ for every } y \in B,$$

implying that

$$B \subset \text{dom} \left( \sup_{x \in A} f(x, \cdot) \right). \quad (27)$$

Next, we introduce the family

$$\mathcal{F}^B := \{L \subset Y : L \text{ is a finite-dimensional linear subspace that intersects } B\},$$

and pick an  $L \in \mathcal{F}^B$ . Arguing as in (23) and using (5), we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in L \cap B} f(x, y) &= \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in Y} (f(x, y) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(y)) \\
&= \max_{x \in A} [-(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B})^*(\theta)] \\
&= \max_{x \in A} [-(\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)))^*(\theta)] \\
&= -\inf_{x \in A} [(\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)))^*(\theta)], \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot))$  denotes the lsc hull of the function  $f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)$  with respect to the variable  $y$ . Furthermore, since the function  $g_L : Y^* \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , defined by

$$g_L(y^*) := \inf_{x \in A} (\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)))^*(y^*) = \inf_{x \in A} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot))^*(y^*),$$

is convex and lsc by Lemma 6, and  $A_1 \subset A$  obviously, the inequality in (28) reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in L \cap B} f(x, y) &= -\overline{\text{co}} \left( \inf_{x \in A} (\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)))^* \right) (\theta) \\
&\geq -\overline{\text{co}} \left( \inf_{x \in A_1} (\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)))^* \right) (\theta). \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the convex function  $\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot))$  above is (lsc and) proper because the convex function  $f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)$  is proper, thanks to (27), and has a finite-dimensional effective domain (see [1]). As a consequence of that, the function

$$\varphi := \sup_{x \in A_1} (\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)))$$

does not take the value  $-\infty$ . Moreover, by (27) we have

$$\emptyset \neq L \cap B \subset \text{dom} \left( \max_{x \in A} f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot) \right) \subset \text{dom} \left( \sup_{x \in A_1} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)) \right), \tag{30}$$

which shows that

$$\text{dom} \left( \sup_{x \in A_1} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)) \right) = \text{dom} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)) = L \cap B \text{ for all } x \in A_1. \tag{31}$$

In other words, since  $\varphi \leq \sup_{x \in A_1} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot))$ , we have  $L \cap B \subset \text{dom} \varphi$  and the function  $\varphi$  is proper. Consequently, (8) entails

$$\varphi^*(\theta) = \overline{\text{co}} \left( \inf_{x \in A_1} (\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)))^* \right) (\theta),$$

and (29) gives rise, according to Moreau's theorem, to

$$\max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in L \cap B} f(x, y) \geq - \left( \sup_{x \in A_1} (\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot))) \right)^* (\theta) = \inf_{y \in Y} \varphi(y). \quad (32)$$

Moreover, due to (31), for each  $x \in A_1$  the set  $\text{dom}(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)) = L \cap B$  is finite-dimensional and, therefore, (9) entails

$$\varphi = \sup_{x \in A_1} (\text{cl}_y(f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot))) = \text{cl}_y \left( \sup_{x \in A_1} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)) \right).$$

In other words, (32) and (4) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in L \cap B} f(x, y) &\geq \inf_{y \in Y} \left( \text{cl}_y \left( \sup_{x \in A_1} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)) \right) \right) \\ &= \inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in A_1} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_{L \cap B}(\cdot)) \\ &\geq \inf_{y \in Y} \sup_{x \in A_1} (f(x, \cdot) + \mathbf{I}_B(\cdot)) = \inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A_1} f(x, \cdot). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Let us, finally, endow the family  $\mathcal{F}^B$  with the partial order given by ascending inclusions,

$$L_1 \preceq L_2, \quad L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{F}^B \Leftrightarrow L_1 \subset L_2.$$

Then, applying Corollary 2 in  $(\mathcal{F}^B, \preceq)$  to the non-increasing net of the usc (concave) functions  $\varphi_L := \inf_{y \in L \cap B} f(\cdot, y)$ ,  $L \in \mathcal{F}^B$ , (33) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} f(x, y) &= \max_{x \in A} \inf_{L \in \mathcal{F}^B} \inf_{y \in L \cap B} f(\cdot, y) \\ &= \max_{x \in A} \inf_{L \in \mathcal{F}^B} \varphi_L(x) = \inf_{L \in \mathcal{F}^B} \max_{x \in A} \varphi_L(x) \\ &\geq \inf_{L \in \mathcal{F}^B} \inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A_1} f(x, \cdot) = \inf_{y \in B} \sup_{x \in A_1} f(x, \cdot), \end{aligned}$$

and we are done with the proof. ■

The classical minimax theorem straightforwardly follows from Theorem 9 when all the functions  $f(x, \cdot)$ ,  $x \in A$ , are convex (that is, when  $A_1 = A$ ). Next, we give a useful application of Theorems 7 and 9. Given  $n \geq 1$ , we denote

$$\Delta_n := \{\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_k \geq 0, \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \lambda_k = 1\}.$$

**Corollary 10** *Given a collection of convex functions  $f_k : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , we write  $f := \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} f_k$  and suppose that  $\text{dom } f \neq \emptyset$ . We assume that at least one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i) *All the  $f_k$ 's are proper.*
- (ii) *All the  $f_k$ 's are lsc.*

Then, we have that

$$\inf_{x \in X} f(x) = \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} \inf_{x \in X} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \lambda_k f_k(x).$$

**Proof.** We consider the function  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \times X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  defined as

$$F(\lambda, x) := f_\lambda(x) - \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x \in X, \quad (34)$$

where  $f_\lambda := \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \lambda_k f_k$ . We also denote  $A := \Delta_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $B := \text{dom } f \subset X$ , and

$$A_0 := \{\lambda \in \Delta_n : \lambda_k > 0 \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Hence, the functions  $F(\cdot, x)$ ,  $x \in B$ , are usc and concave (indeed, affine), whereas the functions  $F(\lambda, \cdot)$ ,  $\lambda \in A$ , are convex. Also, it is clear that the set  $A$  is convex and compact.

Let us first assume that all the  $f_k$ 's are proper, so that  $A \times B \subset F^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$ . Thus, Theorem 9 applies and gives us

$$\max_{\lambda \in A} \inf_{x \in B} F(\lambda, x) = \inf_{x \in B} \max_{\lambda \in A} F(\lambda, x),$$

showing that

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} \inf_{x \in X} f_\lambda(x) = \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} \inf_{x \in \text{dom } f} F(\lambda, x) = \inf_{x \in \text{dom } f} \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} F(\lambda, x) = \inf_{x \in X} f(x),$$

where the last equality comes from the definition of the maximum function.

Second, if all the  $f_k$ 's are lsc, then the functions  $F(\lambda, \cdot) + \mathbb{I}_B$  ( $= F(\lambda, \cdot)$ , as  $B = \text{dom } F(\lambda, \cdot)$ ),  $\lambda \in A_0$ , belong to  $\Gamma_0(X)$ . Thus, by Theorem 7, we obtain that

$$\max_{\lambda \in A} \inf_{x \in B} F(\lambda, x) \geq \inf_{x \in B} \sup_{\lambda \in A_0} F(\lambda, x).$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\inf_{x \in B} \sup_{\lambda \in A_0} F(\lambda, x) = \inf_{x \in \text{dom } f} \sup_{\lambda \in A_0} f_\lambda(x) = \inf_{x \in \text{dom } f} \sup_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} f_\lambda(x),$$

and, as above, we deduce that

$$\inf_{x \in X} f(x) = \inf_{x \in \text{dom } f} \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} F(\lambda, x) \leq \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} \inf_{x \in \text{dom } f} F(\lambda, x) = \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} \inf_{x \in X} F(\lambda, x) \leq \inf_{x \in X} f(x),$$

which in turn leads us to the desired conclusion. ■

Corollary 10 easily allows us to formulate the subdifferential of the maximum function  $f := \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} f_k$ , providing a new proof and a slight extension of [29, Corollary 2.8.11] (see, also, references therein to trace back the origin of this result) to improper functions.

**Corollary 11** *With the assumptions of Corollary 10, for every  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  we*



have that

$$\partial_\varepsilon f(x) = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} \partial_{(\varepsilon + f_\lambda(x) - f(x))} f_\lambda(x), \quad (35)$$

where  $f_\lambda := \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \lambda_k f_k$ . In particular, for  $\varepsilon = 0$  we have

$$\partial f(x) = \bigcup \{ \partial f_\lambda(x) : \lambda \in \Delta_n, f_\lambda(x) = f(x) \}. \quad (36)$$

**Proof.** We fix  $x_0 \in X$  and  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ . Formula (36) is an immediate consequence of (35), due to the fact  $\partial_{(f_\lambda(x_0) - f(x_0))} f_\lambda(x_0)$  is empty whenever  $f_\lambda(x_0) < f(x_0)$ . Thus, we only need to prove the inclusion “ $\subset$ ” in (35) because the opposite inclusion there can be easily checked. Let us first suppose that  $\theta \in \partial_\varepsilon f(x_0)$  or, equivalently, that

$$f(x_0) \leq \inf_{x \in X} f(x) + \varepsilon.$$

Observe that  $f(x_0) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, according to Corollary 10, there exists some  $\bar{\lambda} \in \Delta_n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_0) &\leq \inf_{x \in X} \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} f_\lambda(x) + \varepsilon \\ &= \max_{\lambda \in \Delta_n} \inf_{x \in X} f_\lambda(x) + \varepsilon = \inf_{x \in X} f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have that  $f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x_0) \leq f(x_0) \leq f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x_0) + \varepsilon$  and, so,

$$f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x_0) = f(x_0) + f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x_0) - f(x_0) \leq \inf_{x \in X} f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x) + f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x_0) - f(x_0) + \varepsilon;$$

that is,  $\theta \in \partial_{(f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x_0) - f(x_0) + \varepsilon)} f_{\bar{\lambda}}(x_0)$ .

More generally, if  $x^* \in \partial_\varepsilon f(x_0)$ , then  $\theta \in \partial_\varepsilon (f - \langle x_0^*, \cdot \rangle)(x_0)$  and we apply the paragraph above to the convex functions  $\tilde{f}_k := f_k - \langle x_0^*, \cdot \rangle$ . ■

We close the paper with the following corollary to show that the Moreau theorem (see (6)) can also be obtained from the minimax theorem, Theorem 9. This proves that somehow these two results can be considered equivalent.

**Corollary 12** *For every function  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ , we have that  $f^{**} = f$ .*

**Proof.** Given a function  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ , we fix  $x \in X$  and a  $\theta$ -neighborhood  $U \subset X$ . Then, by definition of the biconjugate, we write

$$f^{**}(x) = \sup_{x^* \in X^*} \inf_{y \in \text{dom } f} g_{x^*}(y) \geq \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \inf_{y \in \text{dom } f} g_{x^*}(y),$$

where the functions  $g_{x^*} \in \Gamma_0(X)$ ,  $x^* \in X^*$ , are defined by

$$g_{x^*}(y) := \langle x^*, x - y \rangle + f(y).$$

Observe that the functions  $x^* \mapsto g_y(x^*)$ ,  $y \in X$ , are concave (and usc). Also, the convex set  $U^\circ$  is  $w^*$ -compact thanks to Dieudonné’s Theorem. Therefore, applying Theorem

7 with  $A := U^\circ$  and  $B := X$  gives rise to

$$f^{**}(x) \geq \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \inf_{y \in X} g_{x^*}(y) = \inf_{y \in X} \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \{\langle x^*, x - y \rangle + f(y)\},$$

which in turn yields, using Example 1,

$$f^{**}(x) \geq \sup_{U \in \mathcal{N}_X} \inf_{y \in X} \sup_{x^* \in U^\circ} \{\langle x^*, x - y \rangle + f(y)\} = f(x).$$

The proof is finished because the inequality  $f^{**}(x) \leq f(x)$  always holds. ■

## References

- [1] BORWEIN, J.M. AND VANDERWERFF, J.D., *Convex Functions: Constructions, Characterizations and Counterexamples*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (UK), 2010.
- [2] BOT, R.I., *Conjugate Duality in Convex Optimization*. Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems, 637, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
- [3] BEDNARCZUK, E.M. AND SYGA, M., On minimax theorems for lower semicontinuous functions in Hilbert spaces. *J. Convex Anal.* **25** (2018) 389–402.
- [4] CORREA, R., HANTOUTE, A. AND LÓPEZ, M.A., Towards Supremum-Sum subdifferential calculus free of qualification conditions. *SIAM J. Optim.* **26** (2016) 2219–2234.
- [5] FAN, K., Minimax theorems, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC, *Proceedings USA* **39** (1953) 42–47.
- [6] GALÁN M.R, An intrinsic notion of convexity for minimax. *J. Convex Anal.* **21** (2014) 1105–1139.
- [7] HANTOUTE, A. AND LÓPEZ, M.A., New Tour on the Subdifferential of Supremum via Finite Sums and Suprema. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **193** (2022) 81–106.
- [8] HANTOUTE, A., LÓPEZ, M. A. AND ZĂLINESCU, C., Subdifferential calculus rules in convex analysis: a unifying approach via pointwise supremum functions. *SIAM J. Optim.* **19** (2008) 863–882.
- [9] HIRIART-URRUTY, J.-B., MOUSSAOUI, M., SEEGER, A. AND VOLLE, M., Subdifferential calculus without qualification conditions, using approximate subdifferentials: a survey. *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* **24** (1995) 1727–1754.
- [10] JEYAKUMAR, V., LEE, G.M. AND LI, G.Y., Alternative theorems for quadratic inequality systems and global quadratic optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.* **20** (2009) 983–1001.

- [11] LÁSZLÓ , S., Minimax results on dense sets and dense families of functionals. *SIAM J. Optim.* **27** (2017) 661–685.
- [12] LI, C. AND NG, K.F., Subdifferential calculus rules for supremum functions in convex analysis. *SIAM J. Optim.* **21** (2011) 782–797.
- [13] LÓPEZ,, M.A. AND VOLLE, M., Subdifferential of the closed convex hull of a function and integration with nonconvex data in general normed spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **390** (2012) 307–312.
- [14] MORDUKHOVICH, B.S., *Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation I, II*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [15] MOREAU, J.J., Théorèmes inf-sup. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **258** (1964) 2720–2722.
- [16] MOREAU, J.J., *Fonctionnelles Convexes*. Lectures Notes, Séminaire “Equations aux dérivées partielles”, Collège de France, 1966, and Rome: Instituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 2003.
- [17] MOSCONI, S.J.N., A differential characterisation of the minimax inequality. *J Convex Anal.* **19** (2012) 185–199.
- [18] MUNKRES, J., *Topology*, 2nd Ed. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 2000.
- [19] VON NEUMANN, J., Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftspiele. *Math. Ann.* **100**, 295–320 (1928). English translation: On the theory of games of strategy. *Contributions to the theory of games vol. 4*, pp. 13–42. Princeton, Princeton. Univ. Press (1959).
- [20] RICCERI B., On a minimax theorem: an improvement, a new proof and an overview of its applications. *Minimax Theory Appl.* **2** (2017) 99–152.
- [21] ROCKAFELLAR, R.T., Minimax theorems and conjugate saddle-functions. *Math. Scand.* **14** (1964) 151–173.
- [22] ROCKAFELLAR, R.T., *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
- [23] ROCKAFELLAR, R.T. AND WETS, R., *Variational Analysis*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 317. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [24] ROUBI, A., Theorems of the Alternative Revisited and Some Extensions of Yuan’s Lemma. *Set-Valued Var. Anal.* **30** (2022) 1213–1232.
- [25] SAINT RAYMOND J., A new minimax theorem for linear operators. *Minimax Theory Appl.* **3** (2018) 131–160.
- [26] SIMONS, S., Minimax theorems and their proofs. In: Du, DZ., Pardalos, P.M. (eds) *Minimax and applications. Nonconvex optimization and its applications*, vol 4. Springer, Boston, MA.

- [27] SIMONS, S., On general minimax theorems. *Pac. J. Math.* **8** (1958) 171–176.
- [28] SUN, C., A minimax theorem for Lindelöf sets. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **179** (2018) 127–136.
- [29] ZĂLINESCU, C., *Convex analysis in general vector spaces*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2002.