### Existence of minimizers

Let  $E:\mathbb{R}^n\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  be l.s.c. and let there exist an  $\alpha$  such that the sublevelset

$$S_{\alpha} := \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid E(u) \le \alpha \}$$

is nonempty and bounded, then

$$\hat{u} \in \arg\min_{u} E(u)$$

exists.

*Proof.* Consider a sequence  $(u_k)_k$  such that  $E(u_k) \to \inf_u E(u)$ . (Remember that the infimum is the largest lower bound on all possible values of E(u).)

We distinguish two cases: For  $\alpha = \inf_u E(u)$  the non-emptyness of  $S_\alpha$  yields the assertion. For  $\alpha > \inf_u E(u)$  it holds that from some sufficiently large  $k_0$  on, we will have  $u_k \in S_\alpha$ . Since  $S_\alpha$  is bounded there exists a convergent subsequence  $u_{k_l} \to \bar{u}$ . Due to the lower semi-continuity we find

$$\inf_{u} E(u) = \lim_{k \to \infty} E(u_k) = \lim_{l \to \infty} E(u_{k_l}) \ge E(\bar{u}).$$

Since by definition  $\inf_u E(u) \leq E(\bar{u})$  we obtain equality and hence there exists  $\bar{u} \in \operatorname{argmin}_u E(u)$ .

**Remark**: This is a fundamental strategy for showing the existence of minimizers since the arguments do not only hold in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  but in arbitrary topologies after replacing "bounded" by "precompact"!

## Equivalence of l.s.c. and closedness

For  $E: \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  the following two statements are equivalent

- E is lower semi-continuous (l.s.c.).
- $\bullet$  E is closed.

*Proof.* Let E be closed and assume that E is not l.s.c.Then there exists a point  $u^0$  and a sequence  $(u_k)_k$  with  $\lim_k u_k = u^0$  such that

$$\liminf_{k} E(u_k) < E(u^0).$$

In particular, there exists  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and a subsequence  $(u_{k_l})_{k_l}$  such that

$$E(u_{k_l}) \le \alpha < E(u^0) \quad \forall k \tag{1}$$

Obviously,  $(u_{k_l}, \alpha) \in \text{epi}(E)$  for all  $k_l$  and  $(u_{k_l}, \alpha) \to (u^0, \alpha)$ , but according to (1)  $(u^0, \alpha) \notin \text{epi}(E)$ , which contradicts the closedness of E.

Now let E be l.s.c. and assume that E is not closed. Then there exists a sequence  $(u_k, \alpha_k) \in \text{epi}(E)$  with  $(u_k, \alpha_k) \to (u^0, \alpha^0) \notin \text{epi}(E)$ . We find

$$\liminf_{k} E(u_k) \le \lim_{k} \alpha_k = \alpha^0 < E(u^0).$$

On the other hand, due to E being l.s.c. we have  $E(u^0) \leq \liminf_k E(u_k)$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$ 

#### Convex functions are locally Lipschitz on int(dom(E)).

As mentioned in the lecture proving this claim in 1d is an exercise for yourself to which you find a solution below. Note that the statements holds in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , too.

*Proof.* Part 1: Let  $x, x_1, x_2 \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom}(E))$  such that  $x_1 < x < x_2$ . Then for  $\alpha = \frac{x_2 - x}{x_2 - x_1}$  we have

$$\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2 = \alpha(x_1 - x_2) + x_2 = x.$$

We can compute

$$E(x) - E(x_1) \le \alpha E(x_1) + (1 - \alpha)E(x_2) - E(x_1)$$

$$= (1 - \alpha)(E(x_2) - E(x_1))$$

$$= \frac{E(x_2) - E(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1}(x - x_1).$$

On the other hand

$$E(x_2) - E(x) \ge E(x_2) - (\alpha E(x_1) + (1 - \alpha)E(x_2))$$

$$= \alpha (E(x_2) - E(x_1))$$

$$= \frac{E(x_2) - E(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1} (x_2 - x),$$

such that

$$\frac{E(x) - E(x_1)}{x - x_1} \le \frac{E(x_2) - E(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1} \le \frac{E(x_2) - E(x)}{x_2 - x}.$$

Now for a given  $x \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(E))$ , pick  $a, b, x_1, x_2 \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(E))$  such that  $a < x_1 < x < x_2 < b$ . We claim that E is Lipschitz on  $]x_1, x_2[$ . For any  $y_1 < y_2 \in ]x_1, x_2[$  we have

$$\frac{E(y_2) - E(y_1)}{y_2 - y_1} \le \frac{E(b) - E(y_1)}{b - y_1} \le \frac{E(b) - E(x_2)}{b - x_2} \tag{2}$$

as well as

$$\frac{E(y_2) - E(y_1)}{y_2 - y_1} \ge \frac{E(y_2) - E(a)}{y_2 - a} \ge \frac{E(x_2) - E(a)}{x_2 - a}.$$
 (3)

Using (2) and (3) we can conclude

$$|E(y_2) - E(y_1)| \le \max\left(\left|\frac{E(x_2) - E(a)}{x_2 - a}\right|, \left|\frac{E(b) - E(x_2)}{b - x_2}\right|\right) |y_2 - y_1|,$$

such that E is Lipschitz on  $]x_1, x_2[$ .

# Example of a convex function that is not continuous.

$$E(u) = \begin{cases} u & \text{if } u > 0\\ 1 & \text{if } u = 0\\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

# The subdifferential $\partial E(u)$ is nonempty and bounded for $u \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom}(E))$

We will use

**Theorem 1** (Supporting Hyperplane Theorem). Let  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  be a convex set and let  $z \in \partial S$ . Then there exists a supporting hyperplane of S which contains z.

*Proof.* Step 1: Show that  $\partial E(u)$  is nonempty for  $u \in \text{ri}(\text{dom}(E))$ :

The point (u, E(u)) is on the boundary of  $\operatorname{epi}(E)$ . Thus, by the supporting hyperplane theorem there exist  $0 \neq (q, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ,  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} q \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} v \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \leq b \quad \forall (v,\alpha) \in \operatorname{epi}(E),$$

and  $b = \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} q \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} u \\ E(u) \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$ . In other words,

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} q \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} v \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} u \\ E(u) \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \leq 0 \quad \forall (v, \alpha) \in \operatorname{epi}(E).$$

We have to exclude a vertical hyperplane, i.e. r = 0. Assume r = 0. Then

$$\langle q, v - u \rangle \le 0, \quad \forall v \in \text{dom}(E).$$

Since  $u \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom}(E))$  there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $u + \epsilon q \in \operatorname{dom}(E)$  which means

$$\epsilon ||q||^2 \le 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad q = 0,$$

and contradicts  $0 \neq (q, r)$ .

To get the "right" inequality, we have to make sure r < 0. Assume r > 0. Then v = u and  $\alpha > E(u)$  violates the supporting hyperplane inequality.

Thus r < 0 and we find

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} q/r \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} v \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} u \\ E(u) \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \ge 0 \quad \forall (v, \alpha) \in \operatorname{epi}(E),$$

which in particular means

$$E(v) - E(u) + \langle q/r, v - u \rangle \ge 0, \quad \forall v \in \text{dom}(E),$$

or  $-q/r \in \partial E(u)$ .

Step 2: Show that  $\partial E(u)$  is bounded for  $u \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom}(E))$ . For  $\epsilon > 0$  sufficiently small, we have

$$M := \bigcup_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \{ u + \epsilon e_k, \ u - \epsilon e_k \} \subset \text{dom}(E).$$

Now let  $b := \max_{q \in M} E(q)$ , and for every  $p \in \partial E(u)$  note that there exists a point  $q \in M$  with

$$E(q) - E(u) - \underbrace{\langle p, q - u \rangle}_{=\epsilon ||p||_{\infty}} \ge 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{b - E(u)}{\epsilon} \ge \frac{E(q) - E(u)}{\epsilon} \ge ||p||_{\infty},$$

is a bound on the infinity norm of all elements in  $\partial E(u)$ .

# For a convex function E that is differentiable at $u \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(E))$ it holds that $\partial E(u) = {\nabla E(u)}$

*Proof.* The subdifferential  $\partial E(u)$  of some convex E at  $u \in \text{dom}(f)$  is given as

$$\{p \in \mathbb{R}^n : E(z) - E(u) - \langle p, z - u \rangle \ge 0, \, \forall \, z \in \text{dom}(f) \}.$$

Since  $u \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(E))$ , we find that for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $z = u \pm \epsilon v \in \text{dom}(E)$  for  $\epsilon$  small enough. Therefore, it holds that

$$E(u + \epsilon v) \ge E(u) + \epsilon \langle p, v \rangle, \quad E(u - \epsilon v) \ge E(u) - \epsilon \langle p, v \rangle,$$

for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\epsilon$  small enough. This implies that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{E(u+\epsilon v) - E(u)}{\epsilon} \geq \langle p,v \rangle, \quad \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{E(u) - E(u-\epsilon v)}{\epsilon} \leq \langle p,v \rangle,$$

which means (using the hint)

$$\langle \nabla E(u),v\rangle \geq \langle p,v\rangle, \quad \langle \nabla E(u),v\rangle \leq \langle p,v\rangle,$$

i.e.

$$\langle \nabla E(u) - p, v \rangle = 0$$

for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . For the particular choice of  $v := \nabla E(u) - p$  we find  $p = \nabla f(u)$ .

The above concludes the proof if we can show that  $\partial f(u)$  is non-empty, which follows from the Theorem "Subdifferentiability" in the lecture.