Mathematika 63 (2017) 383–432
doi:10.1112/S0025579316000309

ENVELOPES FOR SETS AND FUNCTIONS: REGULARIZATION AND GENERALIZED CONJUGACY

A. CABOT, A. JOURANI AND L. THIBAULT

Abstract. Let X be a vector space and let $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ be an extended real-valued function. For every function $f : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$, let us define the φ-envelope of f by

$$f^{\varphi}(x) = \sup_{y \in X} \varphi(x - y) \;\dot{-}\; f(y),$$

where $\dot{-}$ denotes the lower subtraction in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$. The main purpose of this paper is to study in great detail the properties of the important generalized conjugation map $f \mapsto f^{\varphi}$. When the function φ is closed and convex, φ-envelopes can be expressed as Legendre–Fenchel conjugates. By particularizing with $\varphi = (1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$, for $\lambda > 0$ and $p \geqslant 1$, this allows us to derive new expressions of the Klee envelopes with index λ and power p. Links between φ-envelopes and Legendre–Fenchel conjugates are also explored when $-\varphi$ is closed and convex. The case of Moreau envelopes is examined as a particular case. In addition to the φ-envelopes of functions, a parallel notion of envelope is introduced for subsets of X. Given subsets $\Lambda, C \subset X$, we define the Λ-envelope of C as $C^{\Lambda} = \bigcap_{x \in C}(x + \Lambda)$. Connections between the transform $C \mapsto C^{\Lambda}$ and the aforestated φ-conjugation are investigated.

§1. *Introduction.* Given two topological vector spaces X, Y and a function $c : X \times Y \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$, extending the Legendre–Fenchel conjugacy, Moreau [22, Ch. 14, §3] defined, for any function $g : Y \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ its c-conjugate as the function $g^c : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$,

$$g^c(x) := \sup_{y \in Y}(c(x, y) \;\dot{-}\; g(y)) \quad \text{for all } x \in X;$$

see §2 for the (extended) lower subtraction $\dot{-}$. We refer to [4, 6, 7, 9, 17, 22, 31, 37] and the references therein for various duality results in such a context and for several applications. Given a function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ we will focus on the case $c(x, y) := \varphi(x - y)$ and $Y = X$. Otherwise stated, for a function $f : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ we will be interested in the function f^{φ} that we call the φ-envelope of f, defined by

$$f^{\varphi}(x) := \sup_{y \in X}(\varphi(x - y) \;\dot{-}\; f(y)) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Our first aim in this paper is to study in great detail the structure of the transform $f \mapsto f^{\varphi}$ and provide various properties of φ-envelopes.

Received 8 April 2016.
MSC (2010): 52A41, 49J53, 41A65 (primary).

On the other hand, considering the class $\mathcal{B}_X$ of closed balls of a Banach space X, Mazur [19] studied some Banach spaces X for which every closed bounded convex subset is the intersection of some subclass of $\mathcal{B}_X$; we refer to [10] for a rich survey on the subject. Any such Banach space is actually called in the literature a Banach space with the Mazur intersection property. In his 1983 paper [36] Vial defined strongly convex sets of a normed space as convex sets which are intersections of closed balls with a common radius; sets which are intersections, for a fixed real $r > 0$, of closed balls with radius equal to r are called r-strongly convex sets in [36]. This class of convex sets is thoroughly studied by Polovinkin [25] (see also [26] and the references therein). Denoting by $\mathbb{B}_X$ the closed unit ball of X centered at zero, any r-strongly convex set can be represented in the form

$$\bigcap_{x\in S}(x + r\mathbb{B}_X) \quad \text{with some subset } S \subset X.$$

So, given a subset Λ of the space X, our second aim in the paper is to analyze properties of the transform which assigns to each subset C of X the set

$$C^{\Lambda} := \bigcap_{x\in C}(x + \Lambda).$$

We will also provide the connections between the latter transform and the aforestated transform related to φ-envelopes.

In §2 we recall the lower and upper additions (respectively subtractions), and we also recall various concepts and results in convex analysis which will be needed in the paper. Section 3 offers a large list of general properties of φ-envelopes. Section 4 establishes the connections between φ-envelopes and the aforementioned transform $C \mapsto C^{\Lambda}$; many properties of sets which can be represented in this form are also provided. In §5 we examine the question whether $\psi = \varphi(\cdot - a) - \alpha$ (for some $a \in X$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$) whenever ψ is a φ-envelope and φ is a ψ-envelope. A counter-example is constructed and various sufficient conditions are given. The analogous question is also investigated with sets instead of functions. Section 6 considers additional properties in the case when the function φ is either superadditive or subadditive. In §7, assuming that φ is convex and lower semicontinuous, we provide several links between the φ-envelope of a function and Legendre–Fenchel conjugates of other functions related to f. Taking φ as a power of the norm, we also provide various results concerning the Klee envelope $\kappa_{\lambda,p}f$ (with index λ and power p) of a function f, where

$$\kappa_{\lambda,p}f(x) := \sup_{y\in X}\left(\frac{1}{p\lambda}\|x-y\|^p - f(y)\right) \quad \text{for all } x \in X.$$

Finally in §8, assuming that $-\varphi$ is convex and lower semicontinuous, we continue to explore the links between φ-envelopes and Legendre–Fenchel conjugates. By particularizing with $\varphi = -(1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$, for $\lambda > 0$ and $p \geqslant 1$, we obtain several properties of Moreau envelopes with index λ and power p.

§2. *Preliminaries.* Following Moreau [22], we extend the usual addition on $\mathbb{R}$ to $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = [-\infty, +\infty]$. We define the upper addition $\dot{+}$ and the lower addition $\underset{\cdot}{+}$ as the laws extending the usual addition via the following conventions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(-\infty) \dot{+} (+\infty) &= (+\infty) \dot{+} (-\infty) = +\infty, \\
(-\infty) \underset{\cdot}{+} (+\infty) &= (+\infty) \underset{\cdot}{+} (-\infty) = -\infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

This leads to the introduction of the upper subtraction $\dot{-}$ and the lower subtraction $\underset{\cdot}{-}$, respectively defined by

$$
s \dot{-} t = s \dot{+} (-t) \qquad \text{and} \qquad s \underset{\cdot}{-} t = s \underset{\cdot}{+} (-t) \quad \text{for all } s, t \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}.
$$

Let X be a vector space; all vector spaces will be real vector spaces. Given two extended real-valued functions $f, g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the (Moreau) *inf-convolution* (also called *infimal convolution*) of f and g is defined as follows: for every $x \in X$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
(f \triangledown g)(x) &= \inf_{y+z=x} [f(y) \dot{+} g(z)] \\
&= \inf_{y \in X} [f(y) \dot{+} g(x-y)] \\
&= \inf_{z \in X} [f(x-z) \dot{+} g(z)].
\end{aligned}
$$

In a symmetric way, the (Moreau) *sup-convolution* (or *supremal convolution*) of f and g is defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
(f \vartriangle g)(x) &= \sup_{y+z=x} [f(y) \underset{\cdot}{+} g(z)] \\
&= \sup_{y \in X} [f(y) \underset{\cdot}{+} g(x-y)] \\
&= \sup_{z \in X} [f(x-z) \underset{\cdot}{+} g(z)].
\end{aligned}
$$

For the function f as above, the set $\operatorname{dom} f = \{x \in X, f(x) < +\infty\}$ is called the *effective domain* of f. We call f a proper function if $f(x) < +\infty$ for at least one $x \in X$, and $f(x) > -\infty$ for all $x \in X$, or in other words, if $\operatorname{dom} f$ is a non-empty set on which f is finite. The function which is constantly equal to $+\infty$ (respectively $-\infty$) on X is denoted by ω_X (respectively $-\omega_X$).

Now assume that X is a locally convex space; all such spaces in the paper will be Hausdorff. We will denote by X^* the topological dual of X. Then, following again [22], we set

$$
\Gamma(X) := \{f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, f \text{ is a pointwise supremum of a family of continuous affine functions with slopes in } X^*\}
$$

and

$$
\Gamma(X^*) := \{g : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, g \text{ is a pointwise supremum of a family of continuous affine functions with slopes in } X\}.
$$

We denote by $\Gamma_0(X)$ the set of $f \in \Gamma(X)$ which differ from ω_X and $-\omega_X$. In the same way, $\Gamma_0(X^*)$ is the set $\Gamma_0(X^*) = \Gamma(X^*) \setminus \{\omega_{X^*}, -\omega_{X^*}\}$. The classes $\Gamma_0(X)$ and $\Gamma_0(X^*)$ are respectively characterized by

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_0(X) &= \{f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, f \text{ is closed, convex and proper}\}\\ &= \{f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, f \text{ is } w(X, X^*) \text{ closed, convex and proper}\},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Gamma_0(X^*) = \{g : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, g \text{ is } w(X^*, X) \text{ closed, convex and proper}\},$$

see, for example, [1, 8, 22]. Above and in the rest of the paper, $w(X, X^*)$ and $w(X^*, X)$ stand for the weak topology on X and the weak star topology on X^*, respectively.

With the function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is associated, in the duality pairing from X to X^*, its *Legendre–Fenchel conjugate* $f^* : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined by

$$\text{for all } x^* \in X^*, \quad f^*(x^*) = \sup_{\xi \in X}\{\langle x^*, \xi\rangle - f(\xi)\}.$$

In the same way, throughout the paper (unless otherwise stated) the Legendre–Fenchel conjugate of a function $g : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined on the dual space X^* will be taken in the duality pairing from X^* to X, that is, $g^* : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is defined on X by

$$\text{for all } x \in X, \quad g^*(x) = \sup_{\xi^* \in X^*}\{\langle \xi^*, x\rangle - g(\xi^*)\}.$$

The Legendre–Fenchel transform $f \mapsto f^*$ (see, for example, [22]) is known to be a one-to-one mapping from $\Gamma_0(X)$ onto $\Gamma_0(X^*)$. For any $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ one has $f = f^{**}$ and for any $g \in \Gamma_0(X^*)$ one has $g = g^{**}$ (see, for example, [1, 8, 22]).

Given a set $C \subset X$, we denote as usual by δ_C the *indicator function* of C, i.e. $\delta_C(x) = 0$ if $x \in C$ and $\delta_C(x) = +\infty$ if $x \notin C$. The *support function* $\sigma_C : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ of C is defined by

$$\text{for all } x^* \in X^*, \quad \sigma_C(x^*) = \sup_{\xi \in C}\langle x^*, \xi\rangle,$$

so σ_C coincides with the Legendre–Fenchel conjugate of δ_C. For a non-empty cone $K \subset X$, the support function σ_K is equal to the indicator function of the polar cone K° of K defined by

$$K^\circ = \{x^* \in X^*, \langle x^*, x\rangle \leqslant 0 \text{ for all } x \in K\}.$$

For a set $C \subset X$, we denote by $\mathrm{co}(C)$ (respectively $\overline{\mathrm{co}}(C)$) the convex hull (respectively closed convex hull) of C. The $w(X^*, X)$-closed convex hull of a set $D \subset X^*$ is denoted by $\overline{\mathrm{co}}^{w*}(D)$. For a function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, its convex hull $\mathrm{co}(f)$ (respectively lower semicontinuous convex hull $\overline{\mathrm{co}}(f)$) is the greatest convex (respectively lower semicontinuous convex) function less than or equal to f. The $w(X^*, X)$-lower semicontinuous convex hull of a function $g : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is denoted by $\overline{\mathrm{co}}^{w*}(g)$.

If $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ and if $\overline{x} \in \operatorname{dom} f$, the *recession function* f^∞ is defined by

$$\text{for all } u \in X, \quad f^\infty(u) = \lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{f(\overline{x} + tu) - f(\overline{x})}{t} = \sup_{t>0} \frac{f(\overline{x} + tu) - f(\overline{x})}{t}.$$

The function $f^\infty : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ does not depend on the point $\overline{x} \in \operatorname{dom} f$ since it is also given by

$$\text{for all } u \in X, \quad f^\infty(u) = \sup_{x \in \operatorname{dom} f} (f(x+u) - f(x)).$$

The function f^∞ satisfies $f^\infty \in \Gamma_0(X)$, it is positively homogeneous and we have $f^\infty = \sigma_{\operatorname{dom} f^*}$. Given a closed convex set $C \subset X$ and $\overline{x} \in C$, the recession cone C^∞ is defined by

$$C^\infty = \{u \in X, \overline{x} + tu \in C \text{ for all } t \geqslant 0\}.$$

The set C^∞ does not depend on $\overline{x} \in C$ and is also given by

$$C^\infty = \{u \in X, u + C \subset C\}.$$

It follows from the definition that C^∞ is a closed convex cone and we have $\delta_{C^\infty} = (\delta_C)^\infty$. For more details on recession analysis, see, for example, [**1**, **2**, **13**, **28**].

Let us end these preliminaries with the subdifferential of convex analysis. We recall that the *subdifferential* $\partial f(x)$ of a convex function $f : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ at $x \in \operatorname{dom} f$ is the set

$$\partial f(x) = \{\xi^* \in X^*, f(y) \geqslant f(x) + \langle \xi^*, y - x\rangle \text{ for every } y \in X\}. \tag{1}$$

When $x \notin \operatorname{dom} f$, then $\partial f(x) = \emptyset$ by convention. The *domain* and the *range* of the operator $\partial f : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ are respectively given by

$$\operatorname{dom}(\partial f) = \{x \in X, \partial f(x) \neq \emptyset\},$$
$$\operatorname{Rge}(\partial f) = \{x^* \in X^*, \exists x \in X, x^* \in \partial f(x)\}.$$

If $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$, the subdifferentials of f and f^* are connected through the following relation

$$x^* \in \partial f(x) \iff x \in \partial f^*(x^*), \tag{2}$$

for all $x \in X$ and $x^* \in X^*$. For further details, the reader is referred to the classical textbooks on convex analysis, see, for example, [**13**, **28**].

§3. *Definitions, general properties.* Let X be a vector space. For functions $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the φ-*envelope* of f is defined as follows:

$$\text{for all } x \in X, \quad f^\varphi(x) = \sup_{y \in X}\{\varphi(x-y) \dot{-} f(y)\} = \sup_{z \in X}\{\varphi(z) \dot{-} f(x-z)\}.$$

A function $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is said to be a φ-envelope if there exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g = f^{\varphi}$. It is immediate to check that for every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$f^{-\omega_X} = -\omega_X, \quad \text{while } f^{\omega_X} = \begin{cases} \omega_X & \text{if } f \neq \omega_X, \\ -\omega_X & \text{if } f = \omega_X. \end{cases}$$

It ensues that the unique $(-\omega_X)$-envelope is the function $-\omega_X$, while the ω_X-envelopes are $\pm\omega_X$. The function f^{φ} can be expressed via the inf-convolution and sup-convolution operators

$$f^{\varphi} = \varphi \,\triangle\, (-f) = -((-\varphi) \,\triangledown\, f). \tag{3}$$

The roles played by f and φ in the definition of f^{φ} are opposite in the sense that

$$(-\varphi)^{(-f)} = (-f) \,\triangle\, (-(-\varphi)) = (-f) \,\triangle\, \varphi = f^{\varphi}. \tag{4}$$

The definition of f^{φ} is closely connected to the deconvolution operation. For any $g, h : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the *deconvolution* of g and h is the function $g \ominus h$ defined by

$$(g \ominus h)(x) = \sup_{y-z=x} (g(y) \mathbin{\dot{-}} h(z)),$$

for every $x \in X$. Denoting by h_- the function defined by $h_-(x) = h(-x)$ for every $x \in X$, we deduce immediately from the above definition that

$$g \ominus h = g \,\triangle\, (-h_-) = (h_-)^{g}. \tag{5}$$

It ensues that for any $f, \varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$f^{\varphi} = \varphi \ominus f_-.$$

The deconvolution operation has been studied in detail by many authors, see, for example, [3, 12, 14, 38].

Following the terminology of Moreau [21], we call *φ-elementary function* a function of the form $\varphi(\cdot - y) + \lambda$ with $y \in X$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. By using a generalized conjugacy argument, one can show that for any $\varphi, f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$(f^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi} \text{ is the upper envelope of the } \varphi\text{-elementary functions that minorize } f, \tag{6}$$

see, for example, [21, §4] and [30, §11.L]. One can easily deduce the following characterization of φ-envelopes: for any $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$g \text{ is the upper envelope of a family of } \varphi\text{-elementary functions} \tag{7}$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$g = (g^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi} \tag{8}$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$g \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-envelope.} \tag{9}$$

The expression of the double envelope $(g^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi}$ can be developed as follows

$$\begin{aligned}(g^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi} &= \varphi \bigtriangleup (-g^{\varphi_-})\\ &= \varphi \bigtriangleup (-(\varphi_- \bigtriangleup (-g)))\\ &= \varphi \bigtriangleup ((-\varphi_-) \bigtriangledown g).\end{aligned}$$

By using the deconvolution operation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(g^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi} &= \varphi \ominus (\varphi \bigtriangleup (-g_-))\\ &= \varphi \ominus (\varphi \ominus g).\end{aligned}$$

From the equivalence (8) $\Leftrightarrow$ (9), we deduce that

$$\begin{gathered} g \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-envelope}\\ \Updownarrow\\ g = \varphi \bigtriangleup ((-\varphi_-) \bigtriangledown g)\\ \Updownarrow\\ g = \varphi \ominus (\varphi \ominus g).\end{gathered} \tag{10}$$

Now let $f, \psi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Following the terminology of Martinez-Legaz and Penot [**18**], the function f is said to be (exactly) ψ-regular if $f = (f \ominus \psi) \bigtriangledown \psi$. By taking the opposite in each member of the equality (10), we find

$$\begin{aligned}-g &= (-\varphi) \bigtriangledown (\varphi_- \bigtriangleup (-g))\\ &= (-\varphi) \bigtriangledown ((-g) \ominus (-\varphi)).\end{aligned}$$

In view of the above equivalences, this implies that

$$g \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-envelope} \iff -g \text{ is } (-\varphi)\text{-regular in the sense of [18].}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{E}^{\varphi}(X)$, or $\mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ if there is no risk of confusion, the set of φ-envelopes and by $F_{\varphi} : \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-} \to \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ the map defined by $F_{\varphi}(f) = f^{\varphi}$ for every $f \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$. The equivalence (8) $\Leftrightarrow$ (9) says that $F_{\varphi} \circ F_{\varphi_-} = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}^{\varphi}}$ and $F_{\varphi_-} \circ F_{\varphi} = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}}$, otherwise stated we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *The map $F_{\varphi} : \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-} \to \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ is bijective and $(F_{\varphi})^{-1} = F_{\varphi_-}$.*

As a consequence of the previous proposition, if φ is even the map $F_{\varphi} : \mathcal{E}^{\varphi} \to \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ is bijective and $(F_{\varphi})^{-1} = F_{\varphi}$.

Let us now state several general properties of φ-envelopes.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let X be a vector space and let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$.*

(i) *For every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and every $a \in X$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $(f(\cdot - a) - \beta)^{\varphi} = f^{\varphi}(\cdot - a) + \beta$. If $g \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$, then $g(\cdot - a) + \beta \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ for every $a \in X$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$.*

(ii) *Given a family* $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ *of functions* $f_i : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, *we have* $(\inf_{i\in I} f_i)^\varphi = \sup_{i\in I} f_i^\varphi$. *If* $g = \sup_{i\in I} g_i$ *with* $g_i \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ *for every* $i \in I$, *then* $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$.

(iii) *For* $f_1, f_2 : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, *we have* $(f_1 \triangledown f_2)^\varphi = f_1^{(f_2^\varphi)}$. *Let* $g, h : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. *If* $h \in \mathcal{E}^g$ *and* $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, *then* $h \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. *Otherwise stated, if* $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, *then* $\mathcal{E}^g \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi$.

(iv) *For* $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, *we have* $(f^\varphi)_- = f_-^{\varphi_-}$. *As a consequence,* $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ *if and only if* $g_- \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$.

Proof. (i) Let $a \in X$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. For every $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(f(\cdot - a) - \beta)^\varphi(x) &= \sup_{y\in X}\{\varphi(x-y) \dot{-} f(y-a) + \beta\}\\ &= \sup_{y'\in X}\{\varphi(x-a-y') \dot{-} f(y') + \beta\} = f^\varphi(x-a) + \beta.\end{aligned}$$

For the second assertion of (i), it suffices to apply the first part with $g = f^\varphi$.

(ii) By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\inf_{i\in I} f_i\right)^\varphi &= \varphi \vartriangle \left(-\inf_{i\in I} f_i\right)\\ &= \varphi \vartriangle \sup_{i\in I}(-f_i)\\ &= \sup_{i\in I}(\varphi \vartriangle (-f_i)) = \sup_{i\in I} f_i^\varphi, \quad \text{see, for example, [21].}\end{aligned}$$

Now assume that $g = \sup_{i\in I} g_i$ with $g_i \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ for every $i \in I$. Then, for each $i \in I$, we have $g_i = f_i^\varphi$ for some f_i. It ensues that $g = \sup_{i\in I} f_i^\varphi = (\inf_{i\in I} f_i)^\varphi$, hence $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$.

(iii) By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}f_1^{(f_2^\varphi)} &= f_2^\varphi \vartriangle (-f_1)\\ &= (\varphi \vartriangle (-f_2)) \vartriangle (-f_1)\\ &= \varphi \vartriangle ((-f_2) \vartriangle (-f_1))\\ &= \varphi \vartriangle (-(f_2 \triangledown f_1))\\ &= (f_2 \triangledown f_1)^\varphi = (f_1 \triangledown f_2)^\varphi.\end{aligned}$$

Now assume that $h \in \mathcal{E}^g$ and $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. Then there exist $f_1, f_2 : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $h = f_1^g$ and $g = f_2^\varphi$. It ensues that $h = f_1^{(f_2^\varphi)} = (f_1 \triangledown f_2)^\varphi$, hence $h \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$.

(iv) For every $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(f^\varphi)_-(x) &= \sup_{y\in X}\{\varphi(-x-y) \dot{-} f(y)\}\\ &= \sup_{\xi\in X}\{\varphi(-x+\xi) \dot{-} f(-\xi)\}\\ &= \sup_{\xi\in X}\{\varphi_-(x-\xi) \dot{-} f_-(\xi)\} = f_-^{\varphi_-}(x).\end{aligned}$$

If $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, there exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g = f^\varphi$. It ensues that $g_- = (f^\varphi)_- = (f_-)^{\varphi_-}$, hence $g_- \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$. The proof of the reverse assertion is identical. □

The equalities in assertions (i) and (ii) of the above proposition are also consequences of [32, Theorem 3.1]† giving a general description of generalized conjugacy from $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ (the set of functions from X to $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$) into itself. The above proofs are provided for completeness.

In the next proposition, we show that the φ-envelope of a continuous linear functional is affine and we characterize the elements of $\mathcal{E}^\varphi$ that are linear.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let X be a locally convex space. Let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\xi^* \in X^*$. Then we have:*

(i) $\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle^\varphi = -\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle + (-\varphi)^*(\xi^*)$;

(ii) *if $\varphi \neq -\omega_X$, the following equivalence holds*

$$\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi \iff \xi^* \in -\mathrm{dom}(-\varphi)^*.$$

Proof. (i) For every $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle^\varphi(x) &= \sup_{y \in X}\{\varphi(y) - \langle \xi^*, x - y \rangle\} \\ &= -\langle \xi^*, x \rangle + (-\varphi)^*(\xi^*).\end{aligned}$$

(ii) Let $g = \langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle$. We deduce from (i) that

$$g^{\varphi_-} = -\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle + (-\varphi_-)^*(\xi^*) = -\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle + (-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*). \tag{11}$$

First assume that $(-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*) = +\infty$. Then we have $g^{\varphi_-} = \omega_X$, thus implying that $(g^{\varphi_-})^\varphi = -\omega_X$. It ensues that $(g^{\varphi_-})^\varphi \neq g$, which shows that $g \notin \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ according to the equivalence (7) $\iff$ (8). Now assume that $(-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*) < +\infty$. Observe that $(-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*) \in \mathbb{R}$ since

$$(-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*) = -\infty \implies \sup_{x \in X}\langle -\xi^*, x \rangle + \varphi(x) = -\infty \implies \varphi = -\omega_X,$$

which is impossible by assumption. Since $(-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*) \in \mathbb{R}$, we deduce from (11), (i) above and Proposition 3.2(i) that

$$(g^{\varphi_-})^\varphi = \langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle + (-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*) - (-\varphi)^*(-\xi^*) = \langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle = g,$$

and therefore $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. □

For every set $C \subset X$, let us set

$$\Sigma_C = \{f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \mathrm{dom}\, f \subset C\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Sigma_C^* = \{f^*, f \in \Sigma_C\}.$$

We adopt the same notations Σ_D and Σ_D^* for a subset $D \subset X^*$.

THEOREM 3.1. *Let X be a locally convex space and let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be such that $\varphi \neq -\omega_X$. For every subset D of X^*, the following assertions are equivalent:*

† We thank the referee for pointing out the reference [32] to us.

(i) $\Sigma_D^* \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi$;
(ii) $\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\} \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi$;
(iii) $D \subset -\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*$.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Let $D \subset X^*$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\} &= \{g^*, \operatorname{dom} g \subset D \text{ and } g \in \Gamma_0(X)\}\\ &\subset \{g^*, \operatorname{dom} g \subset D\} = \Sigma_D^*.\end{aligned}$$

The implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) follows immediately.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) Assume that

$$\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\} \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi. \tag{12}$$

Let $\xi^* \in D$. Observe that $\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle \in \Gamma_0(X)$ and that

$$\operatorname{dom}(\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle)^* = \operatorname{dom} \delta_{\{\xi^*\}} = \{\xi^*\} \subset D,$$

hence $\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ in view of (12). We then deduce from Proposition 3.3(ii) that $\xi^* \in -\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*$. Since this is true for every $\xi^* \in D$, we conclude that $D \subset -\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*$.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Now assume that $D \subset -\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*$ and let $f \in \Sigma_D^*$. There exists $g : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $f = g^*$ and $\operatorname{dom} g \subset D$. The definition of the Legendre–Fenchel conjugate yields

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sup_{\xi^* \in X^*} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle - g(\xi^*)\}\\ &= \sup_{\xi^* \in \operatorname{dom} g} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle - g(\xi^*)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Recalling that $\operatorname{dom} g \subset D \subset -\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*$, we deduce from Proposition 3.3(ii) that the linear function $\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle$ is a φ-envelope for every $\xi^* \in \operatorname{dom} g$. In view of Proposition 3.2(i), the affine function $\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle - g(\xi^*)$ is also a φ-envelope for every $\xi^* \in \operatorname{dom} g$. Coming back to formula (13), we infer from Proposition 3.2(ii) that f is a φ-envelope as a supremum of φ-envelopes. Finally, we have shown that $f \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, which proves the inclusion $\Sigma_D^* \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. □

Given a set $D \subset X^*$, the following result explores the links between the class Σ_D^* and the class of functions $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ satisfying $\operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D$. When the set D is $w(X^*, X)$-closed and convex, these classes can be characterized via the support function of D.

PROPOSITION 3.4. *Let X be a locally convex space and let D be a non-empty subset of X^*.*

(i) *We have*

$$\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\} \cup \{\omega_X, -\omega_X\} \subset \Sigma_D^*, \tag{14}$$
$$\Sigma_D^* \subset \{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset \overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(D)\} \cup \{\omega_X, -\omega_X\}. \tag{15}$$

As a consequence, if the set $D \subset X^*$ *is* $w(X^*, X)$*-closed and convex, the following equality holds true*

$$\Sigma_D^* = \{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\} \cup \{\omega_X, -\omega_X\}. \tag{16}$$

(ii) *If the set* $D \subset X^*$ *is* $w(X^*, X)$*-closed and convex, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\}\\ &\quad = \{f \in \Gamma_0(X), f^\infty \leqslant \sigma_D\} \qquad (17)\\ &\quad = \{f \in \Gamma_0(X), f(y) \leqslant f(x) + \sigma_D(y-x), \forall x, y \in X\}. \qquad (18)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i) We have already shown the inclusion $\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\} \subset \Sigma_D^*$, see the proof of Theorem 3.1. On the other hand, we always have $-\omega_X \in \Sigma_D^*$. Since $D \neq \emptyset$, we also have $\omega_X \in \Sigma_D^*$. This proves the inclusion (14). Let us now establish (15). Assume that $f \in \Sigma_D^*$. There exists $g : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\operatorname{dom} g \subset D$ and $f = g^*$. We distinguish the cases $\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g)$ proper and $\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g)$ improper. If $\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g) = \omega_{X^*}$, we have $g = \omega_{X^*}$, hence $f = -\omega_X$. If $\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g)$ takes the value $-\infty$, we infer that $g^* = (\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g))^* = \omega_X$, whence $f = \omega_X$. Let us now assume that $\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g) \in \Gamma_0(X^*)$. It ensues that $f = g^* = (\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g))^* \in \Gamma_0(X)$. This implies in turn that $f^* = \overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g)$, thus

$$\operatorname{dom} f^* = \operatorname{dom}(\overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(g)) \subset \overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(\operatorname{dom} g) \subset \overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w*}(D),$$

which ends the proof of (15). When the set D is $w(X^*, X)$-closed and convex, equality (16) is an immediate consequence of the inclusions (14)–(15).

(ii) Assuming that the set D is $w(X^*, X)$-closed and convex, we have $\operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D$ if and only if $\sigma_{\operatorname{dom} f^*} \leqslant \sigma_D$. Recalling that $\sigma_{\operatorname{dom} f^*} = f^\infty$ (see §2), we derive equality (17). Since $f^\infty = \sup_{x \in \operatorname{dom} f}(f(\cdot + x) - f(x))$, we deduce in turn equality (18). □

Remark 3.1. In general, the inclusions (14) and (15) are strict, as will be shown in Example 7.1.

If X is a Banach space and if the set $D \subset X^*$ is closed, the class of functions $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ satisfying $\operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D$ can be expressed via the subdifferential of f.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Let* X *be a Banach space and let* D *be a closed subset of* X^**. Then we have*

$$\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\} = \{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \partial f(x) \subset D \textit{ for all } x \in X\}.$$

Proof. Let us first state as a lemma the following direct consequence of the Brønsted–Rockafellar theorem (see [5, Theorem 2]) concerning the conjugate of a function in $\Gamma_0(X)$.

LEMMA 3.1 (See [5, Theorem 2]). *If* X *is a Banach space and if* $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$, *then* $\operatorname{cl}(\operatorname{dom} f^*) = \operatorname{cl}(\operatorname{Rge}(\partial f))$.

Assume that the set $D \subset X^*$ is closed. From Lemma 3.1, we have for every $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D &\iff \operatorname{Rge}(\partial f) \subset D \\ &\iff \partial f(x) \subset D \quad \text{for all } x \in X. \end{aligned}$$

The announced equality follows immediately. □

Applying Theorem 3.1 with particular sets D, we obtain the following corollaries.

COROLLARY 3.1. *Let X be a locally convex space and let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be such that $\varphi \neq -\omega_X$. Then the following equivalence holds:*

$$\Gamma(X) \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi \iff \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* = X^*.$$

Proof. It suffices to take $D = X^*$ in the equivalence (i) ⇔ (iii) of Theorem 3.1. □

Remark 3.2. Under the assumption $\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* = X^*$, the function φ cannot be convex (see hereafter). Therefore, the set $\mathcal{E}^\varphi$ is strictly larger than $\Gamma(X)$, since it contains the non-convex function φ.

If $\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* = X^*$, we have $(-\varphi)^*(0) < +\infty$. Recalling that $(-\varphi)^*(0) = \sup \varphi$, we deduce that the function φ is bounded from above on the whole space X. If, moreover, the function φ is convex, we infer from a classical result that it is constant, say $\varphi \equiv \beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. It ensues that $(-\varphi)^* = \beta + \delta_{\{0\}}$, hence $\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* = \{0\}$, a contradiction. This confirms that functions φ with $\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* = X^*$ cannot be convex.

Given a set $K \subset X$, recall that a function $f : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is said to be K-non-increasing (respectively K-non-decreasing) if $f(y) \leqslant f(x)$ (respectively $f(y) \geqslant f(x)$) for all $x, y \in X$ such that $y - x \in K$.

COROLLARY 3.2. *Let X be a locally convex space. Let $K \subset X$ be a closed convex cone and let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be such that $\varphi \neq -\omega_X$. Then the set $\mathcal{E}^\varphi$ contains all the functions of $\Gamma_0(X)$ which are K-non-increasing if and only if $-K^\circ \subset \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*$.*

Proof. Take $D = K^\circ$ in the equivalence (ii) ⇔ (iii) of Theorem 3.1 to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset K^\circ\} \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi &\iff K^\circ \subset -\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* \\ &\iff -K^\circ \subset \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

On the other hand, observe by (18) that for $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset K^\circ &\iff f(y) \leqslant f(x) + \sigma_{K^\circ}(y - x) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X \\ &\iff f(y) \leqslant f(x) + \delta_K(y - x) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X \\ &\iff f \text{ is } K\text{-non-increasing}. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The announced equivalence then follows immediately from (19) and (20). □

In the following, when X is a normed space we will denote by $\mathbb{B}_X$ (respectively $\mathbb{B}_{X^*}$) the closed unit ball of X (respectively X^*).

COROLLARY 3.3. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space. Let a real $k \geqslant 0$ and let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be such that $\varphi \neq -\omega_X$. Then the set $\mathcal{E}^\varphi$ contains all the functions of $\Gamma_0(X)$ which are k-Lipschitz continuous on X if and only if $k\mathbb{B}_{X^*} \subset \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*$.*

Proof. Take $D = k\mathbb{B}_{X^*}$ in the equivalence (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) of Theorem 3.1 to obtain that

$$\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset k\mathbb{B}_{X^*}\} \subset \mathcal{E}^\varphi \iff k\mathbb{B}_{X^*} \subset -\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* \iff k\mathbb{B}_{X^*} \subset \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*. \tag{21}$$

Then observe by (18) that for $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$,

$$\operatorname{dom} f^* \subset k\mathbb{B}_{X^*} \iff f(y) \leqslant f(x) + k\|y - x\| \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X \iff f \text{ is } k\text{-Lipschitz on } X, \tag{22}$$

where the last equivalence is obtained by reversing the roles of x and y. The announced equivalence then follows immediately from (21) and (22). ☐

§4. *Equivalence between functions and sets.* Recall that for $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the epigraph (respectively hypograph) of f is defined by

$$\operatorname{epi} f = \{(x, \lambda) \in X \times \mathbb{R}, f(x) \leqslant \lambda\}$$
$$(\text{respectively } \operatorname{hypo} f = \{(x, \lambda) \in X \times \mathbb{R}, f(x) \geqslant \lambda\}).$$

The following result allows us to express the epigraph of f^φ as an intersection of sets which are translated from the epigraph of φ.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Let X be a vector space and let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$.*

(i) *For every $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we have*

$$\operatorname{epi} f^\varphi = \bigcap_{u \in \operatorname{hypo}(-f)} u + \operatorname{epi} \varphi.$$

(ii) *For every $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the following equivalence holds:*

$$g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi \iff \operatorname{epi} g = \bigcap_{u \in U} u + \operatorname{epi} \varphi \quad \textit{for some } U \subset X \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. (i) For every $x \in X$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the following equivalences hold true:

$$\begin{aligned}
(x, \lambda) \in \operatorname{epi} f^\varphi &\iff f^\varphi(x) \leqslant \lambda \\
&\iff \varphi(x - y) \dot{-} f(y) \leqslant \lambda \quad \text{for every } y \in X \\
&\iff \varphi(x - y) - \mu \leqslant \lambda \quad \text{for every } (y, \mu) \in \operatorname{epi} f \\
&\iff (x - y, \lambda + \mu) \in \operatorname{epi} \varphi \quad \text{for every } (y, \mu) \in \operatorname{epi} f \\
&\iff (x, \lambda) \in (y, -\mu) + \operatorname{epi} \varphi \quad \text{for every } (y, \mu) \in \operatorname{epi} f \\
&\iff (x, \lambda) \in u + \operatorname{epi} \varphi \quad \text{for every } u \in \operatorname{hypo}(-f).
\end{aligned}$$

The announced equality follows.

(ii) Let $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. If $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, there exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g = f^\varphi$. In view of (i), we obtain that $\operatorname{epi} g = \bigcap_{u \in U} u + \operatorname{epi} \varphi$ with $U = \operatorname{hypo}(-f)$. Conversely, assume that $\operatorname{epi} g = \bigcap_{u \in U} u + \operatorname{epi} \varphi$ for some $U \subset X \times \mathbb{R}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{epi} g &= \bigcap_{(x,\lambda)\in U} (x, \lambda) + \operatorname{epi} \varphi \\ &= \bigcap_{(x,\lambda)\in U} \operatorname{epi}[\varphi(\cdot - x) + \lambda] \\ &= \operatorname{epi}\Big[\sup_{(x,\lambda)\in U} \varphi(\cdot - x) + \lambda\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we deduce that $g = \sup_{(x,\lambda)\in U}(\varphi(\cdot - x) + \lambda)$, which shows by (i) and (ii) in Proposition 3.2 that $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. □

Given a set $\Lambda \subset X$, the previous result suggests to consider the class $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ of subsets of X defined as follows†

$$\mathcal{I}^\Lambda = \{C^\Lambda, C \subset X\}, \quad \text{where } C^\Lambda = \bigcap_{x \in C} x + \Lambda.$$

By convention‡, we take $\emptyset^\Lambda = \bigcap_{x\in\emptyset} x + \Lambda = X$ for every set $\Lambda \subset X$. This implies that $X \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ for every $\Lambda \subset X$. It is immediate to check that $\mathcal{I}^X = \{X\}$, while $\mathcal{I}^\emptyset = \{\emptyset, X\}$. A set $D \subset X$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ if it is equal to some intersection of translated sets from Λ. It ensues immediately that the class $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ is stable under translation and intersection.

Example 4.1. Take $r > 0$ and $\Lambda = r\mathbb{B}_X$. The class $\mathcal{I}^{r\mathbb{B}_X}$ corresponds to the class studied by Vial [36] under the terminology of r-strongly convex sets. More generally, for a closed convex set $\Lambda \subset X$, the sets of the form C^Λ are called Λ-strongly convex. The Λ-strongly convex sets are thoroughly studied by Polovinkin [25], under an additional condition on the set Λ (which is assumed to be generating, see [25] for more details).

The definition of C^Λ is directly linked to the star-difference of sets. For every $C_1, C_2 \subset X$, the star-difference of C_1 with C_2 is the set $C_1 \overset{*}{-} C_2$ given by

$$C_1 \overset{*}{-} C_2 = \bigcap_{x \in C_2} C_1 - x.$$

We deduce immediately from the above definition that $C^\Lambda = \Lambda \overset{*}{-} (-C)$ for every $C, \Lambda \subset X$. The star-difference of sets was used in [27] in the context of differential games. See also [12] for the links between the star-difference of sets and the deconvolution operation, also called epigraphical star-difference.

Given $C \subset X$ and $\Lambda \subset X$, the next proposition gives several expressions for the set C^Λ.

† We draw the attention of the reader to the fact that the notation C^Λ must not be confused with that of the set of maps from Λ into C.
‡ In particular, we obtain $\emptyset^\emptyset = X$.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Let X be a vector space. For any sets $C \subset X$ and $\Lambda \subset X$, we have:*

(i) $C^\Lambda = \{x \in X, x - C \subset \Lambda\} = \{x \in X, C \subset x - \Lambda\}$;
(ii) $X \setminus C^\Lambda = C + (X \setminus \Lambda)$ *or equivalently* $C^{X\setminus\Lambda} = X \setminus (C + \Lambda)$;
(iii) $(X \setminus \Lambda)^{X\setminus C} = C^\Lambda$.

Proof. (i) It suffices to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} x \in C^\Lambda &\iff \text{for all } u \in C, x \in u + \Lambda \\ &\iff \text{for all } u \in C, x - u \in \Lambda \\ &\iff x - C \subset \Lambda \\ &\iff C \subset x - \Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) From the definition of C^Λ, we deduce immediately that

$$X \setminus C^\Lambda = \bigcup_{u \in C} u + (X \setminus \Lambda) = C + (X \setminus \Lambda),$$

which is the first equality in (ii). From this equality with $X \setminus \Lambda$ in place of Λ, we obtain that $X \setminus C^{X\setminus\Lambda} = C + \Lambda$, or equivalently $C^{X\setminus\Lambda} = X \setminus (C + \Lambda)$.

(iii) We infer from the previous assertion that

$$X \setminus [(X \setminus \Lambda)^{X\setminus C}] = (X \setminus \Lambda) + C = X \setminus C^\Lambda,$$

whence the equality $(X \setminus \Lambda)^{X\setminus C} = C^\Lambda$. □

The elements D of $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ can be characterized by the equality $(D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda = D$. This is the subject of the next proposition.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Let X be a vector space and let $\Lambda \subset X$. For any set $D \subset X$, the set $(D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda$ is the smallest element of $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ containing the set D. As a consequence, the following equivalence holds true:*

$$D \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda \iff (D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda = D.$$

Proof. Let S be the subset of X defined by

$$S = \bigcap_{x \in X, x+\Lambda \supset D} x + \Lambda.$$

We clearly have $S \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ and $S \supset D$. Now let any $S' \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ with $S' \supset D$. By definition, there exists some $C \subset X$ such that $S' = \bigcap_{x \in C} x + \Lambda$. The inclusion $S' \supset D$ implies that $x + \Lambda \supset D$ for every $x \in C$ and therefore

$$S' = \bigcap_{x \in C} x + \Lambda \supset \bigcap_{x \in X, x+\Lambda \supset D} x + \Lambda = S.$$

This proves that the set S is the smallest element of $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ containing D. Recall now from Proposition 4.2(i) that condition $x+\Lambda \supset D$ is equivalent to $x \in D^{-\Lambda}$. We deduce that

$$S = \bigcap_{x\in D^{-\Lambda}} x+\Lambda = (D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda.$$

This finishes the proof of the first assertion. The second assertion is an immediate consequence of the first. □

Let us write the expression of the double envelope $(D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda$ by using the star-difference operation

$$\begin{aligned}(D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda &= \Lambda \overset{*}{-} (-(D^{-\Lambda}))\\ &= \Lambda \overset{*}{-} ((-D)^\Lambda)\\ &= \Lambda \overset{*}{-} (\Lambda \overset{*}{-} D).\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In view of Proposition 4.2, the complement of the set $(D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}X\setminus(D^{-\Lambda})^\Lambda &= D^{-\Lambda} + X\setminus\Lambda\\ &= (-(X\setminus\Lambda))^{X\setminus D} + X\setminus\Lambda\\ &= ((X\setminus D)\overset{*}{-}(X\setminus\Lambda)) + X\setminus\Lambda.\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

From equalities (23)–(24) and Proposition 4.3, we deduce that

$$\begin{gathered}D\in\mathcal{I}^\Lambda\\ \Updownarrow\\ D = \Lambda \overset{*}{-} (\Lambda \overset{*}{-} D)\\ \Updownarrow\\ X\setminus D = ((X\setminus D)\overset{*}{-}(X\setminus\Lambda)) + X\setminus\Lambda.\end{gathered}$$

The last equality amounts to saying that the set $X\setminus D$ is exactly $(X\setminus\Lambda)$-regular in the sense of [**18**].

With the notation introduced above, for $f, g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the results of Proposition 4.1 can be restated as

$$\operatorname{epi} f^\varphi = (\operatorname{hypo}(-f))^{\operatorname{epi}\varphi}$$

and

$$g\in\mathcal{E}^\varphi \iff \operatorname{epi} g \in \mathcal{I}^{\operatorname{epi}\varphi}.$$

This shows that the study of φ-envelopes amounts to that of the class $\mathcal{I}^{\operatorname{epi}\varphi}$. Conversely, given a set $\Lambda\subset X$, the class $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ can be fully described via the δ_Λ-envelopes.

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Let X be a vector space and let $\Lambda \subset X$.*

(i) *For every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we have*†

$$f^{\delta_\Lambda} = -\inf_X f + \delta_{(\mathrm{dom}\, f)^\Lambda}. \tag{25}$$

As a consequence, the equality $(\delta_C)^{\delta_\Lambda} = \delta_{C^\Lambda}$ holds for any non-empty set $C \subset X$.

(ii) *For every function $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g \neq \pm\omega_X$, we have*

$$g \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda} \iff g = \beta + \delta_{C^\Lambda} \quad \textit{for some } \beta \in \mathbb{R} \textit{ and some } C \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. (i) For every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and every $x \in X$, the definition of f^{δ_Λ} gives

$$f^{\delta_\Lambda}(x) = \sup_{y \in X}\{\delta_\Lambda(x-y) \dot{-} f(y)\} = \sup_{y \in \mathrm{dom}\, f}\{\delta_\Lambda(x-y) - f(y)\}.$$

First assume that $x - \mathrm{dom}\, f \subset \Lambda$. For every $y \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$, we then have $x - y \in \Lambda$, whence $\delta_\Lambda(x-y) = 0$. It ensues that

$$f^{\delta_\Lambda}(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathrm{dom}\, f} -f(y) = \sup_X(-f) = -\inf_X f.$$

Now assume that $x - \mathrm{dom}\, f \not\subset \Lambda$. In this case, there exists $y \in \mathrm{dom}\, f$ such that $x - y \notin \Lambda$. We then have $\delta_\Lambda(x-y) = +\infty$, whence $f^{\delta_\Lambda}(x) = +\infty$. Finally, we obtain for every $x \in X$,

$$f^{\delta_\Lambda}(x) = \begin{cases} -\inf\limits_X f & \text{if } x - \mathrm{dom}\, f \subset \Lambda, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Condition $x - \mathrm{dom}\, f \subset \Lambda$ is equivalent to $x \in (\mathrm{dom}\, f)^\Lambda$ in view of Proposition 4.2(i). Formula (25) follows immediately. For the last assertion, it suffices to take $f = \delta_C$.

(ii) Let $g \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda}$ be such that $g \neq \pm\omega_X$. There exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g = f^{\delta_\Lambda}$, hence we deduce from (i) that $g = -\inf_X f + \delta_{(\mathrm{dom}\, f)^\Lambda}$. Since $g \neq \pm\omega_X$, we have $\inf_X f \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathrm{dom}\, f \neq \emptyset$. It suffices then to take $\beta = -\inf_X f$ and $C = \mathrm{dom}\, f$. Conversely, assume that $g = \beta + \delta_{C^\Lambda}$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $C \neq \emptyset$. Assertion (i) then shows that $g = f^{\delta_\Lambda}$ for the function f defined by $f = -\beta + \delta_C$, hence $g \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda}$. □

Remark 4.1. The previous proposition shows that for every $C, \Lambda \subset X$ with $C \neq \emptyset$,

$$(\delta_C)^{\delta_\Lambda} = (-\delta_C) \bigtriangleup \delta_\Lambda = \delta_{C^\Lambda}. \tag{26}$$

† If $\inf_X f = +\infty$ we have $\mathrm{dom}\, f = \emptyset$, hence $(\mathrm{dom}\, f)^\Lambda = X$ and $\delta_{(\mathrm{dom}\, f)^\Lambda} \equiv 0$. Therefore, the addition in the right-hand side of (25) is well-defined.

It is interesting to compare this formula with the following one

$$(\delta_C)^{-\delta_\Lambda} = (-\delta_C) \vartriangle (-\delta_\Lambda) = -\delta_{C+\Lambda}, \tag{27}$$

that is obtained as a consequence of the equality $\delta_{C+\Lambda} = \delta_C \triangledown \delta_\Lambda$.

COROLLARY 4.1. *Let X be a vector space. For every set $\Lambda \subset X$ and every set $D \subset X$ such that $D \neq \emptyset$ and $D \neq X$, the following equivalence holds:*

$$\delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda} \iff D \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda.$$

In fact, the implication from the left to the right is true as soon as $D \neq \emptyset$, while the reverse one is true if $D \neq X$.

Proof. First assume that $\delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda}$ and that $D \neq \emptyset$. There exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\delta_D = f^{\delta_\Lambda}$, hence we deduce from Proposition 4.4(i) that $\delta_D = -\inf_X f + \delta_{(\operatorname{dom} f)^\Lambda}$. Since $D \neq \emptyset$, we have $\inf_X f = 0$ and $D = (\operatorname{dom} f)^\Lambda \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$. Conversely, assume that $D \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ and that $D \neq X$. This implies that $D = C^\Lambda$ for some $C \neq \emptyset$, and hence by Proposition 4.4(i) again $\delta_D = \delta_{C^\Lambda} = (\delta_C)^{\delta_\Lambda} \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda}$. □

Let us now study the class $\mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda}$. From the generalized conjugation point of view, the case $\varphi = -\delta_\Lambda$ is a special instance of a coupling functional $c : X \times Y \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ of the type $c = -\delta_G$, where G is a subset of $X \times Y$. The corresponding conjugation operator, which arises in quasiconvex analysis, has been considered in many papers, see, for example, [**17**, **33**, **37**].

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Let X be a vector space. Let Λ be a non-empty subset of X and let $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Then:*

(i) *we have*

$$f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda} \iff f = \sup_{y \in \Lambda} \inf_{z \in \Lambda} f(\cdot - y + z); \tag{28}$$

this means equivalently that for every $x \in X$ and every $\lambda < f(x)$, there exists $y \in \Lambda$ such that $f(x - y + z) \geqslant \lambda$ for every $z \in \Lambda$;

(ii) *if $f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda}$ and if $\Lambda + \Lambda \subset \Lambda$, then f is Λ-non-decreasing; conversely, if f is Λ-non-decreasing and if $0 \in \Lambda$, then $f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda}$.*

Proof. (i) The equivalence (7) $\iff$ (8) yields

$$f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda} \iff f = (f^{(-\delta_\Lambda)_-})^{-\delta_\Lambda}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$f^{(-\delta_\Lambda)_-} = \sup_{\xi \in X} -\delta_\Lambda(-\xi) \dot{-} f(\cdot - \xi) = \sup_{-\xi \in \Lambda} -f(\cdot - \xi) = -\inf_{z \in \Lambda} f(\cdot + z)$$

and, hence,

$$(f^{(-\delta_\Lambda)_-})^{-\delta_\Lambda} = \sup_{y\in\Lambda} -f^{(-\delta_\Lambda)_-}(\cdot - y) = \sup_{y\in\Lambda}\inf_{z\in\Lambda} f(\cdot - y + z).$$

We deduce immediately the equivalence (28).

Since the inequality $(f^{(-\delta_\Lambda)_-})^{-\delta_\Lambda} \leqslant f$ is always satisfied, we infer that $f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda}$ if and only if for every $x \in X$,

$$\sup_{y\in\Lambda}\inf_{z\in\Lambda} f(x - y + z) \geqslant f(x).$$

The last assertion of (i) follows immediately.

(ii) Assume that $f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda}$ and that $\Lambda + \Lambda \subset \Lambda$. Let $\xi \in \Lambda$. In view of (28), we have for every $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x+\xi) &= \sup_{y\in\Lambda}\inf_{z\in\Lambda} f(x+\xi - y + z) \\ &= \sup_{y\in\Lambda}\inf_{z'\in\xi+\Lambda} f(x - y + z') \\ &\geqslant \sup_{y\in\Lambda}\inf_{z'\in\Lambda} f(x - y + z') \quad \text{since } \xi + \Lambda \subset \Lambda \\ &= f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for every $\xi \in \Lambda$, we infer that f is Λ-non-decreasing.

Conversely, assume that f is Λ-non-decreasing and that $0 \in \Lambda$. For every $y, z \in \Lambda$, we have

$$f(\cdot - y) \leqslant f(\cdot - y + z) \leqslant f(\cdot + z).$$

It ensues immediately that

$$\sup_{y\in\Lambda} f(\cdot - y) \leqslant \sup_{y\in\Lambda}\inf_{z\in\Lambda} f(\cdot - y + z) \leqslant \inf_{z\in\Lambda} f(\cdot + z).$$

Since $0 \in \Lambda$, we obtain $\sup_{y\in\Lambda} f(\cdot - y) = \inf_{z\in\Lambda} f(\cdot + z) = f$, and hence $f = \sup_{y\in\Lambda}\inf_{z\in\Lambda} f(\cdot - y + z)$. In view of (28), we conclude that $f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda}$. □

Remark 4.2. When $\Lambda + \Lambda \subset \Lambda$ and $0 \in \Lambda$, the equivalence

$$f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda} \iff f \text{ is } \Lambda\text{-non-decreasing}$$

can be recovered by using the subadditivity of the function δ_Λ, see §6.

For a function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $r \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the notation $[f \geqslant r]$ (respectively $[f > r]$) denotes the set $\{x \in X, f(x) \geqslant r\}$ (respectively $\{x \in X, f(x) > r\}$). We adopt the corresponding notation for the sublevel sets.

PROPOSITION 4.6. *Given a vector space X and $\Lambda \subset X$, let $f, g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be extended real-valued functions.*

(i) *For every $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we have*

$$[f^{-\delta_\Lambda} \leqslant \lambda] = [f < -\lambda]^{X\setminus\Lambda}.$$

(ii) *Assume that for every $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, there exists $C_\lambda \subset X$ such that*

$$[g \leqslant \lambda] = C_\lambda^{X\setminus\Lambda}.$$

Then we have $g = (-h)^{-\delta_\Lambda}$ for the function $h : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ defined by $h(x) = \sup\{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, x \in C_\lambda\}$.

(iii) *The following assertions are equivalent:*

(a) $g \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda}$;

(b) *for all $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $[g \leqslant \lambda] \in \mathcal{I}^{X\setminus\Lambda}$.*

Proof. (i) For every $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $x \in X$, the following equivalences hold:

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-\delta_\Lambda}(x) \leqslant \lambda &\iff \text{for all } y \in X, -\delta_\Lambda(x-y) \dot{-} f(y) \leqslant \lambda \\ &\iff \text{for all } y \in X, x-y \in \Lambda \implies -f(y) \leqslant \lambda \\ &\iff \text{for all } y \in X, -f(y) > \lambda \implies x-y \in X\setminus\Lambda \\ &\iff \text{for all } y \in [f < -\lambda], \quad x \in y + X\setminus\Lambda \\ &\iff x \in [f < -\lambda]^{X\setminus\Lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce the equality $[f^{-\delta_\Lambda} \leqslant \lambda] = [f < -\lambda]^{X\setminus\Lambda}$.

(ii) Fix $x \in X$ and observe that

$$g(x) = \sup\{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, g(x) > \lambda\}. \tag{29}$$

By assumption, we have for every $\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$[g \leqslant \lambda] = \bigcap_{y \in C_\lambda} y + X\setminus\Lambda,$$

hence $[g > \lambda] = \bigcup_{y\in C_\lambda} y + \Lambda$. From (29), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= \sup\{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \exists y \in C_\lambda, x \in y + \Lambda\} \\ &= \sup\{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \exists y \in x - \Lambda, y \in C_\lambda\} \\ &= \sup\Bigg(\bigcup_{y\in x-\Lambda} \{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, y \in C_\lambda\}\Bigg) \\ &= \sup_{y\in x-\Lambda} (\sup\{\lambda \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, y \in C_\lambda\}) \\ &= \sup_{y\in x-\Lambda} h(y) \\ &= \sup_{y\in X}(-\delta_\Lambda(x-y) \dot{+} h(y)) = (-h)^{-\delta_\Lambda}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for every $x \in X$, we conclude that $g = (-h)^{-\delta_\Lambda}$.

(iii) The implication (a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b) follows immediately from (i), while the converse implication is a consequence of (ii). □

COROLLARY 4.2. *Let X be a vector space and let $\Lambda \subset X$. Assume that the function $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is such that $g(X) = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. If* $\inf g = -\infty$, *the assertions (a) and (b) of Proposition 4.6(iii) are equivalent to the following:*

(b′) *for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $[g \leqslant \alpha_i] \in \mathcal{I}^{X\setminus\Lambda}$;*

while if $\inf g > -\infty$, *they are equivalent to:*

(b″) *for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $[g \leqslant \alpha_i] \in \mathcal{I}^{X\setminus\Lambda}$ and $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. If $\inf g = -\infty$, assertion (b) of Proposition 4.6(iii) is clearly equivalent to (b′), while if $\inf g > -\infty$, one has to add the complementary condition $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}^{X\setminus\Lambda}$. Then observe that

$$\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}^{X\setminus\Lambda} \Longleftrightarrow X^{X\setminus\Lambda} = \emptyset \Longleftrightarrow X + \Lambda = X \Longleftrightarrow \Lambda \neq \emptyset,$$

and hence the equivalence (b) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (b″) follows. □

COROLLARY 4.3. *Given a vector space X, let $\Lambda \subset X$ and $D \subset X$. The following equivalences hold:*

(i) $-\delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda} \Longleftrightarrow X \setminus D \in \mathcal{I}^{X\setminus\Lambda}$;

(ii) $\delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda} \Longleftrightarrow D \in \mathcal{I}^{X\setminus\Lambda}$ *and* $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. For (i) (respectively (ii)) it suffices to apply Corollary 4.2 with the function $g = -\delta_D$ (respectively $g = \delta_D$), which takes the values $\alpha_1 = -\infty$, $\alpha_2 = 0$ (respectively $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 = +\infty$). □

Combining Corollaries 4.1 and 4.3, we derive the following result giving various characterizations of $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ via the classes $\mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}}$.

COROLLARY 4.4. *For every set $\Lambda \subset X$ and every set $D \subset X$ such that $D \neq \emptyset$ and $D \neq X$, the following equivalences hold:*

$$D \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda \iff \delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda} \iff -\delta_{X\setminus D} \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}} \iff \delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}}.$$

Proof. The first equivalence is a consequence of Corollary 4.1, under the assumptions $D \neq \emptyset$ and $D \neq X$. The equivalence $D \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda \iff -\delta_{X\setminus D} \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}}$ follows from Corollary 4.3(i) applied with $X \setminus D$ (respectively $X \setminus \Lambda$) in place of D (respectively Λ). If $\Lambda \neq X$, the equivalence $D \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda \iff \delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}}$ is a consequence of Corollary 4.3(ii) applied with $X \setminus \Lambda$ in place of Λ. If $\Lambda = X$, the equivalence becomes $D \in \mathcal{I}^X \iff \delta_D \in \mathcal{E}^{-\omega_X}$. Since $\mathcal{I}^X = \{X\}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{-\omega_X} = \{-\omega_X\}$, the equivalence amounts to $D = X \iff \delta_D = -\omega_X$. The condition $D = X$ is not realized by assumption, while the condition $\delta_D = -\omega_X$ is never realized. It ensues that the equivalence trivially holds true if $\Lambda = X$. □

By combining Proposition 3.3(ii) and Proposition 4.6(iii), we obtain the following statement.

PROPOSITION 4.7. *Let X be a locally convex space. Let $\Lambda \subset X$ and $\xi^* \in X^*$. If $\Lambda \neq X$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

(a) $[\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle \leqslant 0] \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$;
(b) *for all* $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $[\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle \leqslant \lambda] \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$;
(c) $\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}}$;
(d) $\xi^* \in -\operatorname{dom} \sigma_{X\setminus\Lambda}$.

Proof. For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $[\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle \leqslant \lambda]$ is translated from the set $[\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle \leqslant 0]$. Since the class $\mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ is stable under translations, the equivalence (a) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (b) follows immediately. Recalling that $\Lambda \neq X$, we have $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$, hence the inclusion in (b) holds for $\lambda = -\infty$. Since $X \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$, the inclusion in (b) is also satisfied for $\lambda = +\infty$. The equivalence (b) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (c) can then be deduced from Proposition 4.6(iii) applied with $X \setminus \Lambda$ in place of Λ. Finally, the equivalence (c) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (d) follows from Proposition 3.3(ii) applied with $\varphi = -\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}$. □

Let us denote by $\mathcal{C}(X)$ the class of non-empty closed convex sets of X.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let X be a locally convex space. Let $\Lambda \subset X$ be such that $\Lambda \neq X$. For every cone $Q \subset X^*$, the following equivalence holds true:*

$$\{C \in \mathcal{C}(X), \operatorname{dom} \sigma_C \subset Q\} \subset \mathcal{I}^\Lambda \iff Q \subset -\operatorname{dom} \sigma_{X\setminus\Lambda}.$$

Proof. Let $Q \subset X^*$ be a cone and assume that

$$\{C \in \mathcal{C}(X), \operatorname{dom} \sigma_C \subset Q\} \subset \mathcal{I}^\Lambda. \tag{30}$$

Let $\xi^* \in Q$. Setting $C = [\langle \xi^*, \cdot \rangle \leqslant 0] \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, we have $\sigma_C = \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+\xi^*}$, and hence $\operatorname{dom} \sigma_C = \mathbb{R}_+\xi^* \subset Q$. In view of (30), it ensues that $C \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$. We then deduce from Proposition 4.7 that $\xi^* \in -\operatorname{dom} \sigma_{X\setminus\Lambda}$. Since this is true for every $\xi^* \in Q$, we conclude that $Q \subset -\operatorname{dom} \sigma_{X\setminus\Lambda}$.

Now assume that $Q \subset -\operatorname{dom} \sigma_{X\setminus\Lambda}$ and let $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ be such that $\operatorname{dom} \sigma_C \subset Q$. Then $\delta_C \in \Gamma_0(X)$ with $\operatorname{dom} \delta_C^* \subset Q$, and since

$$Q \subset -\operatorname{dom} \sigma_{X\setminus\Lambda} = -\operatorname{dom} \delta^*_{X\setminus\Lambda} = -\operatorname{dom}(-(-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}))^*,$$

by Theorem 3.1 we have $\delta_C \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda}}$ (keep in mind $-\delta_{X\setminus\Lambda} \neq -\omega_X$ since $\Lambda \neq X$). Corollary 4.3(ii) yields that $C \in \mathcal{I}^\Lambda$ as desired. Finally, we have shown the inclusion (30), which ends the proof. □

Applying Theorem 4.1 with $Q = X^*$, we immediately obtain the following result.

COROLLARY 4.5. *Let X be a locally convex space. Let $\Lambda \subset X$ be such that $\Lambda \neq X$. Then, the following equivalence holds true:*

$$\mathcal{C}(X) \subset \mathcal{I}^\Lambda \iff \operatorname{dom} \sigma_{X\setminus\Lambda} = X^*.$$

§5. *A preorder relation on $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ based on φ-envelopes.* Let X be a vector space and let $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ be the set of extended real-valued functions on X. We define the relation $\sim$ on the space $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ as follows: for every $\varphi, \psi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi \sim \varphi &\iff \text{there exist } \xi \in X \text{ and } \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \psi = \varphi(\cdot - \xi) + \alpha \\ &\iff \psi \text{ is a } \varphi\text{-elementary function.}\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the relation $\sim$ is reflexive, symmetric and transitive, hence defines an equivalence relation. The objective of this section is to determine suitable† subsets $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ such that the following implication holds true for every $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{G}$:

$$\psi \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{E}^{\psi} \implies \psi \sim \varphi. \tag{31}$$

5.1. *The coercive case.* For any function $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the deconvolution function $\varphi \ominus \varphi$ defined by $(\varphi \ominus \varphi)(x) = \sup_{y-z=x}(\varphi(y) \dot{-} \varphi(z))$ can be expressed as a φ-envelope via the equality $\varphi \ominus \varphi = (\varphi_{-})^{\varphi}$. The next lemma shows that this function is subadditive. Recall that a function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is said to be subadditive if for any $x, y \in X$,

$$f(x + y) \leqslant f(x) \dot{+} f(y).$$

LEMMA 5.1. *Let X be a vector space and let $f, \varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. For any x, $x' \in X$, we have*

$$f^{\varphi}(x') \leqslant (\varphi \ominus \varphi)(x' - x) \dot{+} f^{\varphi}(x).$$

Moreover, the function $\varphi \ominus \varphi$ is subadditive.

Proof. Fix $x, x' \in X$. It is immediate to check that for every $y \in X$,

$$\varphi(x' - y) \dot{-} f(y) \leqslant [\varphi(x' - y) \dot{-} \varphi(x - y)] \dot{+} [\varphi(x - y) \dot{-} f(y)].$$

Taking the supremum over $y \in X$ and using [**21**, Proposition 4.a] we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}f^{\varphi}(x') &\leqslant \sup_{y\in X}[\varphi(x' - y) \dot{-} \varphi(x - y)] \dot{+} \sup_{y\in X}[\varphi(x - y) \dot{-} f(y)], \\ &= (\varphi \ominus \varphi)(x' - x) \dot{+} f^{\varphi}(x),\end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired inequality. Further taking $f = \varphi_{-}$ in the above inequality and using the identity $(\varphi_{-})^{\varphi} = \varphi \ominus \varphi$, we obtain

$$(\varphi \ominus \varphi)(x') \leqslant (\varphi \ominus \varphi)(x' - x) \dot{+} (\varphi \ominus \varphi)(x),$$

hence the function $\varphi \ominus \varphi$ is subadditive. □

† The implication (31) is not true for all $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})$, see a counterexample in §5.3.

If the space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is normed and if the function φ satisfies the coercivity property $\lim_{\|x\|\to+\infty} \varphi(x)/\|x\| = +\infty$, the following lemma shows that $\varphi \ominus \varphi = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space and let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be an extended real-valued function. Assume that $\varphi \neq +\omega_X$ and $\lim_{\|x\|\to+\infty} \varphi(x)/\|x\| = +\infty$. Then we have $\varphi \ominus \varphi = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$.*

Proof. Let us argue by contradiction and assume that there exists $u \neq 0$ such that $(\varphi \ominus \varphi)(u) < +\infty$. Let us fix $\overline{x} \in \operatorname{dom} \varphi$ and observe that for every† $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\overline{x} + nu) \dot{-} \varphi(\overline{x}) &\leqslant (\varphi \ominus \varphi)(nu) \\ &\leqslant n(\varphi \ominus \varphi)(u) \quad \text{since } \varphi \ominus \varphi \text{ is subadditive.} \end{aligned}$$

It ensues that

$$\frac{1}{n}\varphi(\overline{x} + nu) \leqslant \frac{1}{n}\varphi(\overline{x}) + (\varphi \ominus \varphi)(u),$$

and taking the upper limit as $n \to +\infty$, we deduce that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\varphi(\overline{x} + nu) \leqslant (\varphi \ominus \varphi)(u),$$

which contradicts the fact that $\lim_{\|x\|\to+\infty} \varphi(x)/\|x\| = +\infty$. Finally, we obtain that $\varphi \ominus \varphi = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$. □

THEOREM 5.1. *Let X be a vector space and let $\varphi, \psi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be such that $\psi \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}^\psi$.*

(i) *If $\varphi \ominus \varphi = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$, then we have $\psi \sim \varphi$.*
(ii) *Assume that $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed space. If $\lim_{\|x\|\to+\infty} \varphi(x)/\|x\| = +\infty$ (respectively $\lim_{\|x\|\to+\infty} \varphi(x)/\|x\| = -\infty$), then we have $\psi \sim \varphi$.*

Proof. If $\varphi = \pm\omega_X$, it is immediate to check that $\psi = \varphi$. From now on, let us assume that $\varphi \neq \pm\omega_X$. Since $\psi \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}^\psi$, there exist $f, g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $-\psi = (-\varphi) \triangledown f$ and $-\varphi = (-\psi) \triangledown g$. It ensues that

$$-\varphi = (-\varphi) \triangledown (f \triangledown g). \tag{32}$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\varphi) \triangledown (f \triangledown g) \geqslant -\varphi &\iff (-\varphi)(x - y) \dot{+} (f \triangledown g)(y) \geqslant -\varphi(x) \\ &\qquad \text{for all } x, y \in X \\ &\iff (f \triangledown g)(y) \geqslant \varphi(x - y) \dot{-} \varphi(x) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X \\ &\iff (f \triangledown g)(y) \geqslant \sup_{x\in X}(\varphi(x - y) \dot{-} \varphi(x)) \\ &\qquad \text{for all } y \in X \\ &\iff f \triangledown g \geqslant [\varphi \ominus \varphi]_-. \end{aligned}$$

† Here $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of positive integers.

(i) Assume that $\varphi \ominus \varphi = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$. We then deduce from the above inequality that

$$f \bigtriangledown g = +\infty \quad \text{on } X \setminus \{0\}. \tag{33}$$

If $f \bigtriangledown g = \omega_X$, we infer from (32) that $\varphi = -\omega_X$, thus implying in turn that $\psi = -\omega_X$. If $f \bigtriangledown g \neq \omega_X$, equality (33) shows that $\operatorname{dom}(f \bigtriangledown g) = \{0\}$. Recalling that $\operatorname{dom}(f \bigtriangledown g) = \operatorname{dom} f + \operatorname{dom} g$, we deduce that $\operatorname{dom} f + \operatorname{dom} g = \{0\}$. Hence, there exists $\xi \in X$ such that $\operatorname{dom} f = \{\xi\}$ and $\operatorname{dom} g = \{-\xi\}$. We infer that

$$-\psi = (-\varphi) \bigtriangledown f = (-\varphi)(\cdot - \xi) \dot{+} f(\xi) \tag{34}$$

and

$$-\varphi = (-\psi) \bigtriangledown g = (-\psi)(\cdot + \xi) \dot{+} g(-\xi). \tag{35}$$

If $f(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}$, we obtain from (34) that $\psi = \varphi(\cdot - \xi) - f(\xi)$ and therefore $\psi \sim \varphi$. If $g(-\xi) \in \mathbb{R}$, equality (35) shows that $\varphi = \psi(\cdot + \xi) - g(-\xi)$, and hence $\varphi \sim \psi$. On the other hand, if $f(\xi) = g(-\xi) = -\infty$, we deduce from (34)–(35) that

$$-\psi \leqslant (-\varphi)(\cdot - \xi) \quad \text{and} \quad -\varphi \leqslant (-\psi)(\cdot + \xi),$$

thus implying that $\psi = \varphi(\cdot - \xi)$ and therefore $\psi \sim \varphi$.

(ii) First assume that $\lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} \varphi(x)/\|x\| = +\infty$. We infer from Lemma 5.2 that $\varphi \ominus \varphi = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$ and we conclude with (i).

Now assume that $\lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} \varphi(x)/\|x\| = -\infty$. From Lemma 5.2, we deduce that $(-\varphi) \ominus (-\varphi) = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$. Recalling that

$$(-\varphi) \ominus (-\varphi) = (-\varphi_-)^{-\varphi} = \varphi^{\varphi_-} = [(\varphi_-)^{\varphi}]_- = [\varphi \ominus \varphi]_-,$$

we infer that $\varphi \ominus \varphi = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$ and we conclude again with (i). □

Let us define the relation $\preceq$ on $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ by

$$\psi \preceq \varphi \iff \psi \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}.$$

The relation $\preceq$ is clearly reflexive, and also transitive in view of Proposition 3.2(iii). It is compatible with the equivalence relation $\sim$, i.e.

$$\varphi \sim \varphi', \quad \psi \sim \psi' \quad \text{and} \quad \psi \preceq \varphi \implies \psi' \preceq \varphi'.$$

It ensues that we can properly define the relation $\preceq$ on the quotient set $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})/\sim$. The relation $\preceq$ so defined on $\mathcal{F}(X, \overline{\mathbb{R}})/\sim$ is clearly reflexive and transitive, hence it is a preorder. Let us denote by $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{G}'$ and $\mathcal{G}''$ the following respective sets:

$$\mathcal{G} = \{f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}},\ f \ominus f = +\infty \text{ on } X \setminus \{0\}\},$$
$$\mathcal{G}' = \left\{f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}},\ \lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} f(x)/\|x\| = +\infty\right\},$$
$$\mathcal{G}'' = \left\{f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}},\ \lim_{\|x\| \to +\infty} f(x)/\|x\| = -\infty\right\}.$$

Theorem 5.1 expresses that for every $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{G}$ (respectively $\mathcal{G}', \mathcal{G}''$), we have

$$\psi \preceq \varphi, \qquad \varphi \preceq \psi \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \psi \sim \varphi.$$

Hence, the induced relation $\preceq$ on the quotient set $\mathcal{G}/\sim$ (respectively $\mathcal{G}'/\sim$, $\mathcal{G}''/\sim$) is antisymmetric, thus giving rise to an order relation.

Let us now specialize the result of Theorem 5.1 in the case of sets. We define the equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ by

$$C \sim D \iff \text{there exists } \xi \in X \text{ such that } D = C + \xi,$$

along with the preorder relation $\preceq$ on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ by

$$C \preceq D \iff C \in \mathcal{I}^D.$$

Recall that the star-difference $C \overset{*}{-} C$ is defined by

$$C \overset{*}{-} C = \bigcap_{x \in C} C - x = (-C)^C.$$

By applying Theorem 5.1 with indicator functions, we obtain the following corollary.

COROLLARY 5.1. *Let X be a vector space and let $\Gamma, \Delta \subset X$ be such that $\Delta \in \mathcal{I}^\Gamma$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}^\Delta$.*

(i) *If $\Gamma \overset{*}{-} \Gamma = \{0\}$, then we have $\Delta \sim \Gamma$.*

(ii) *Assume that $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed space. If the set Γ (respectively $X \setminus \Gamma$) is bounded, then we have $\Delta \sim \Gamma$.*

Proof. If $\Gamma \in \{\emptyset, X\}$ (respectively $\Delta \in \{\emptyset, X\}$), it is immediate to check that $\Delta = \Gamma$. Let us now assume that $\Gamma \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$ and $\Delta \notin \{\emptyset, X\}$. In view of Corollary 4.1, the assumptions $\Delta \in \mathcal{I}^\Gamma$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}^\Delta$ imply that $\delta_\Delta \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Gamma}$ and $\delta_\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Delta}$.

(i) Assume that $\Gamma \overset{*}{-} \Gamma = \{0\}$. Then, by (5) and Proposition 4.4(i), we have

$$\delta_\Gamma \ominus \delta_\Gamma = (\delta_{-\Gamma})^{\delta_\Gamma} = \delta_{(-\Gamma)^\Gamma} = \delta_{\Gamma \overset{*}{-} \Gamma} = \delta_{\{0\}}.$$

By applying Theorem 5.1(i) with $\varphi = \delta_\Gamma$ and $\psi = \delta_\Delta$, we obtain that $\delta_\Delta \sim \delta_\Gamma$ and hence $\Delta \sim \Gamma$.

(ii) First assume that Γ is bounded. Then the indicator function δ_Γ is coercive and we deduce from Lemma 5.2 that $\delta_\Gamma \ominus \delta_\Gamma = +\infty$ on $X \setminus \{0\}$. This implies that $\Gamma \overset{*}{-} \Gamma = \{0\}$ and we conclude with (i). Now assume that $X \setminus \Gamma$ is bounded. From what precedes, we have $(X \setminus \Gamma) \overset{*}{-} (X \setminus \Gamma) = \{0\}$. Observing that

$$\Gamma \overset{*}{-} \Gamma = (-\Gamma)^\Gamma = (X \setminus \Gamma)^{-X \setminus \Gamma} = -[(-X \setminus \Gamma)^{X \setminus \Gamma}] = -[(X \setminus \Gamma) \overset{*}{-} (X \setminus \Gamma)],$$

we infer that $\Gamma \overset{*}{-} \Gamma = \{0\}$ and we conclude again with (i). $\square$

Let us denote by $\mathcal{Q}$, $\mathcal{Q}'$ and $\mathcal{Q}''$ the following respective sets:

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{C \subset X, C \overset{*}{-} C = \{0\}\},$$
$$\mathcal{Q}' = \{C \subset X, C \text{ is bounded}\},$$
$$\mathcal{Q}'' = \{C \subset X, X \setminus C \text{ is bounded}\}.$$

The above corollary expresses that for every Γ, $\Delta \in \mathcal{Q}$ (respectively $\mathcal{Q}'$, $\mathcal{Q}''$), we have

$$\Delta \preceq \Gamma, \quad \Gamma \preceq \Delta \implies \Delta \sim \Gamma.$$

Hence, the induced relation $\preceq$ on the quotient set $\mathcal{Q}/\sim$ (respectively $\mathcal{Q}'/\sim$, $\mathcal{Q}''/\sim$) is antisymmetric, thus giving rise to an order relation.

5.2. *The case* φ, $\psi \in -\Gamma_0(X)$. Let us first state a result that will be a key ingredient for the next theorem.

LEMMA 5.3. *Let X be a vector space, let $D \subset X$ be a convex set and let us denote by* $\mathrm{Aff}(D)$ *the affine space generated by D. Assume that a real-valued function $h : D \to \mathbb{R}$ is both convex and concave. Then there exists a unique affine function $\tilde{h} : \mathrm{Aff}(D) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{h}_{|D} = h$.*

For a proof of this result, the reader is referred to [**35**]. By extending affinely the function $\tilde{h}$ to the whole space X, we deduce from the above result that there exists a linear function $\ell : X \to \mathbb{R}$ along with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $h = \ell_{|D} + \alpha$.

In view of stating the next theorem, given a locally convex space X recall that the Mackey topology $\tau(X^*, X)$ on X^* is defined as the finest locally convex topology $\mathcal{T}$ on X^* such that the topological dual of $(X^*, \mathcal{T})$ coincides with X. If $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is normed, this topology is exactly that associated with the dual norm $\|\cdot\|_{X^*}$ provided that $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a reflexive Banach space.

THEOREM 5.2. *Let X be a locally convex space. Let φ, $\psi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be functions such that $\psi \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}^{\psi}$. Assume that either:*

- *the space X is finite-dimensional; or*
- *one of the functions $(-\varphi)^*$ and $(-\psi)^*$ is $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous at some point and finite at this point.*

Then we have $(-\varphi)^{**} \sim (-\psi)^{**}$. If each of the functions $-\varphi$ and $-\psi$ has a continuous affine minorant, then $\overline{\mathrm{co}}(-\varphi) \sim \overline{\mathrm{co}}(-\psi)$. In particular, if $-\varphi \in \Gamma_0(X)$ and $-\psi \in \Gamma_0(X)$, then we have $\varphi \sim \psi$.

Proof. By assumption, we have $-\psi = (-\varphi) \triangledown f$ and $-\varphi = (-\psi) \triangledown g$, for some $f, g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Taking the conjugates, we obtain that

$$(-\psi)^* = (-\varphi)^* \dotplus f^* \qquad \text{and} \qquad (-\varphi)^* = (-\psi)^* \dotplus g^*. \tag{36}$$

First observe that if one of the functions $(-\varphi)^*$, $(-\psi)^*$, f^* or g^* is equal to $-\omega_{X^*}$, then equalities (36) imply that $(-\varphi)^* = (-\psi)^* = -\omega_{X^*}$. This implies in turn that $\varphi = \psi = -\omega_X$ and the conclusion is satisfied. From now on, let us assume that the functions $(-\varphi)^*$, $(-\psi)^*$, f^* and g^* differ from $-\omega_{X^*}$. From the first equality of (36), we deduce that $\mathrm{dom}(-\psi)^* \subset \mathrm{dom}(-\varphi)^*$, while the second equality of (36) yields $\mathrm{dom}(-\varphi)^* \subset \mathrm{dom}(-\psi)^*$. Finally, the domains of $(-\varphi)^*$ and $(-\psi)^*$ coincide and both functions are finite on their common domain D. If the set D is empty, then $(-\varphi)^* = (-\psi)^* = \omega_{X^*}$. This implies that $(-\varphi)^{**} = (-\psi)^{**} = -\omega_X$, hence the conclusion is trivially satisfied. Without loss of generality, we now assume that $D \neq \emptyset$. By combining both equalities of (36), we obtain

$$(-\varphi)^* = (-\varphi)^* + f^* + g^*.$$

It ensues that $f^* + g^* = 0$ on D. Hence, the function $f^*{}_{|D}$ is finite-valued on D and both convex and concave. By applying the previous lemma with $h = f^*{}_{|D}$, we obtain that there exist a linear function $\ell : X^* \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f^* = \ell + \alpha$ on D. Coming back to the first equality of (36), we deduce that

$$(-\psi)^* = (-\varphi)^* + \ell + \alpha.$$

Observe that the above equality holds true on the whole space X^*, since the functions $(-\varphi)^*$ and $(-\psi)^*$ are equal to $+\infty$ outside D. Taking the conjugate of each member, we find for every $\xi \in X$,

$$(-\psi)^{**}(\xi) = \sup_{x^* \in X^*} [\langle x^*, \xi\rangle - (-\varphi)^*(x^*) - \ell(x^*) - \alpha]. \tag{37}$$

Let us now show that the linear function ℓ is $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous on X^*.

LEMMA 5.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5.2, the function $\ell : X^* \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous on X^*.*

Proof of Lemma 5.1. If the space X is finite-dimensional, the assertion is obvious. Now assume that the function $(-\varphi)^*$ is $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous at some $\overline{x}^* \in X^*$ and finite at this point. There exist a $\tau(X^*, X)$-neighborhood W of $\overline{x}^*$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(-\varphi)^* \leqslant M$ on W. We deduce from (37) that for every $\xi \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}(-\psi)^{**}(\xi) &\geqslant \sup_{x^* \in W} [\langle x^*, \xi\rangle - (-\varphi)^*(x^*) - \ell(x^*) - \alpha]\\ &\geqslant \sup_{x^* \in W} [\langle x^*, \xi\rangle - \ell(x^*)] - M - \alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Let us argue by contradiction and assume that ℓ is not $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous on X^*. Since the linear function $\langle \cdot, \xi\rangle - \ell$ is not $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous on X^*, the above supremum equals $+\infty$. It ensues that $(-\psi)^{**} = \omega_X$, and hence $-\psi = \omega_X$. Recalling that $-\varphi = (-\psi) \triangledown g$, we deduce that $-\varphi = \omega_X$. This implies in turn that $(-\varphi)^* = -\omega_{X^*}$, a contradiction with $(-\varphi)^*(\overline{x}^*) \in \mathbb{R}$. We conclude that the linear function ℓ is $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous on X^*. Since φ and ψ play symmetric roles, the same conclusion holds true if the function $(-\psi)^*$ is assumed to be $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous at some $\tilde{x}^* \in X^*$ and finite at this point. □

From the previous lemma and the definition of the Mackey topology $\tau(X^*, X)$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $\ell(x^*) = \langle x^*, x\rangle$ for every $x^* \in X^*$. In view of (37), we deduce that

$$(-\psi)^{**}(\xi) = \sup_{x^* \in X^*} [\langle x^*, \xi - x\rangle - (-\varphi)^*(x^*)] - \alpha = (-\varphi)^{**}(\xi - x) - \alpha.$$

Since this is true for every $\xi \in X$, we conclude that $(-\psi)^{**} \sim (-\varphi)^{**}$. If the function $(-\varphi)$ (respectively $(-\psi)$) admits a continuous affine minorant, we have $(-\varphi)^{**} = \overline{\text{co}}(-\varphi)$ (respectively $(-\psi)^{**} = \overline{\text{co}}(-\psi)$). We infer that $\overline{\text{co}}(-\psi) \sim \overline{\text{co}}(-\varphi)$. The last assertion of the statement is a direct consequence of what precedes. □

Remark 5.1. If the normed space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is reflexive, the $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuity assumption on $(-\varphi)^*$ (respectively $(-\psi)^*$) amounts to the continuity assumption with respect to the dual norm $\|\cdot\|_{X^*}$.

Theorem 5.2 implies that the relation $\preceq$ defines an order on the following set:

$$\{\varphi \in -\Gamma_0(X), (-\varphi)^* \text{ is } \tau(X^*, X)\text{-continuous at some point}\}/\sim.$$

If the space X is finite-dimensional, the relation $\preceq$ is an order on the set $(-\Gamma_0(X))/\sim$.

By applying Theorem 5.2 with the opposite of indicator functions, we obtain the following corollary.

COROLLARY 5.2. *Let X be a locally convex space. Let Γ, $\Delta \subset X$ be such that $\Delta \in \mathcal{I}^\Gamma$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}^\Delta$. Assume that either:*

- *the space X is finite-dimensional; or*
- *one of the functions $\sigma_{X\setminus\Gamma}$ and $\sigma_{X\setminus\Delta}$ is $\tau(X^*, X)$-continuous at some point.*

Then we have $\overline{\text{co}}(X \setminus \Gamma) \sim \overline{\text{co}}(X \setminus \Delta)$. In particular, if the sets $X \setminus \Gamma$ and $X \setminus \Delta$ are closed and convex, then $\Gamma \sim \Delta$.

Proof. From Corollary 4.3(i), condition $\Delta \in \mathcal{I}^\Gamma$ (respectively $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}^\Delta$) is equivalent to $-\delta_{X\setminus\Delta} \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Gamma}}$ (respectively $-\delta_{X\setminus\Gamma} \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{X\setminus\Delta}}$). By applying Theorem 5.2 with $\varphi = -\delta_{X\setminus\Gamma}$ and $\psi = -\delta_{X\setminus\Delta}$, we obtain the existence of $\xi \in X$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\overline{\text{co}}(\delta_{X\setminus\Delta}) = [\overline{\text{co}}(\delta_{X\setminus\Gamma})](\cdot - \xi) - \alpha.$$

We immediately deduce that $\overline{\text{co}}(X \setminus \Delta) = \overline{\text{co}}(X \setminus \Gamma) + \xi$. The last assertion of the statement is a direct consequence of what precedes. □

5.3. *A counterexample.* Let us start with a preliminary result.

LEMMA 5.4. *Let X be a topological vector space and let G be a dense additive subgroup of X. Assume that $K \subset X$ is an open set such that $K + K \subset K$ and $0 \in \text{cl}(K)$. Then we have:*

(i) *for all* $\xi, \xi' \in X$,

$$[G \cap (K + \xi)] + [G \cap (K + \xi')] = G \cap (K + \xi + \xi');$$

(ii) *if, in addition,* $\mathrm{cl}(K) \cap -\mathrm{cl}(K) = \{0\}$, *then*

$$G \cap (K + \xi) = (G \cap K) + \xi' \implies \xi = \xi';$$

if $G \neq X$ *and* $\xi \in X \setminus G$, *there is no* $\xi' \in X$ *such that* $G \cap (K + \xi) = (G \cap K) + \xi'$.

Proof. (i) Let us fix $\xi, \xi' \in X$ and let us prove the inclusion from the left to the right. Observe that

$$[G \cap (K + \xi)] + [G \cap (K + \xi')] \subset G + G$$

and

$$[G \cap (K + \xi)] + [G \cap (K + \xi')] \subset (K + \xi) + (K + \xi').$$

Since $G + G \subset G$ and $K + K \subset K$, we deduce that

$$[G \cap (K + \xi)] + [G \cap (K + \xi')] \subset G \cap (K + \xi + \xi').$$

Now let us establish the reverse inclusion. Let $x \in G \cap (K + \xi + \xi')$. Observe that the open set $K + \xi + \xi' - x$ contains 0. Recalling that $0 \in \mathrm{cl}(K)$, we have $(K + \xi + \xi' - x) \cap -K \neq \emptyset$, hence $(K + \xi - x) \cap (-K - \xi') \neq \emptyset$. Since the set K is open, the set $(K + \xi - x) \cap (-K - \xi')$ is open. By using the density of G in X, we deduce that

$$G \cap (K + \xi - x) \cap (-K - \xi') \neq \emptyset.$$

Since $G = -G$, the above property can be rewritten as

$$[G \cap (K + \xi - x)] \cap [-G \cap (-K - \xi')] \neq \emptyset,$$

which is, in turn, equivalent to

$$0 \in [G \cap (K + \xi - x)] + [G \cap (K + \xi')].$$

Recalling that $x \in G$, we have $G = G - x$, hence

$$G \cap (K + \xi - x) = [G \cap (K + \xi)] - x.$$

In view of the latter inclusion, we conclude that

$$x \in [G \cap (K + \xi)] + [G \cap (K + \xi')].$$

The inclusion

$$G \cap (K + \xi + \xi') \subset [G \cap (K + \xi)] + [G \cap (K + \xi')]$$

is proved.

(ii) Let us assume that $G \cap (K + \xi) = (G \cap K) + \xi'$ for some $\xi, \xi' \in X$. We deduce that $G \cap (K + \xi) \subset K + \xi'$. By using the openness of the set $K + \xi$ along with the density of G in X, we easily infer that $K + \xi \subset \mathrm{cl}(K) + \xi'$. This implies, in turn, that $\mathrm{cl}(K) + \xi \subset \mathrm{cl}(K) + \xi'$ and since $0 \in \mathrm{cl}(K)$, we obtain $\xi - \xi' \in \mathrm{cl}(K)$. By a symmetric argument, we find $\xi' - \xi \in \mathrm{cl}(K)$, hence $\xi - \xi' \in \mathrm{cl}(K) \cap -\mathrm{cl}(K)$. Since $\mathrm{cl}(K) \cap -\mathrm{cl}(K) = \{0\}$ by assumption, we conclude that $\xi = \xi'$.

Now let $\xi \in X \setminus G$ and assume that there exists $\xi' \in X$ such that $G \cap (K + \xi) = (G \cap K) + \xi'$. From what precedes, we have $\xi' = \xi$ and, hence, $G \cap (K + \xi) = (G + \xi) \cap (K + \xi)$. On the other hand, the assumption $\xi \in X \setminus G$ implies that the sets G and $G + \xi$ are disjoint. We deduce that $G \cap (K + \xi) = \emptyset$, a contradiction since the non-empty set K is open and the set G is dense in X. □

Let us now build an example of sets $\Gamma, \Delta \subset X$ satisfying $\Delta \in \mathcal{I}^\Gamma$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}^\Delta$, but with Δ and Γ not equal up to a translation. We are given an open set $K \subset X$ such that $K + K \subset K$ and $\mathrm{cl}(K) \cap -\mathrm{cl}(K) = \{0\}$, along with a dense additive subgroup $G \subset X$ such that $G \neq X$. Define the sets $C, U, V \subset X$ respectively by

$$C = G \cap K; \qquad U = G \cap (K + \xi); \qquad V = G \cap (K - \xi),$$

where $\xi \in X \setminus G$. In view of Lemma 5.4(i), the set $D = C + U$ satisfies

$$D = G \cap (K + \xi) \qquad \text{and} \qquad D + V = G \cap K = C.$$

Lemma 5.4(ii) shows that the set D is not translated from C. Defining the complementary sets $\Gamma = X \setminus C$ and $\Delta = X \setminus D$, we have

$$\Delta = X \setminus (C + U) = U^{X \setminus C} = U^\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}^\Gamma \tag{38}$$

and

$$\Gamma = X \setminus (D + V) = V^{X \setminus D} = V^\Delta \in \mathcal{I}^\Delta. \tag{39}$$

From what precedes, the set Δ is not translated from Γ. The above counterexample for sets obviously furnishes a counterexample for functions. Indeed, we deduce from (38)–(39) that the indicator functions δ_Γ and δ_Δ satisfy $\delta_\Delta \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Gamma}$ and $\delta_\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Delta}$, but the functions δ_Γ and δ_Δ are not equal up to a translation.

By particularizing the above sets $G, K \subset X$, one obtains various counterexamples. If $X = \mathbb{R}$, one can take $G = \mathbb{Q}$, $K =]0, +\infty[$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. On the other hand, if X is infinite-dimensional, one can assume that G is a dense subspace of X and that K is an open convex cone such that $\mathrm{cl}(K)$ is pointed. This furnishes a counterexample with convex sets $C, D \subset X$.

§6. *Cases of either superadditivity or subadditivity of φ.* Let us first recall that a function $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is said to be superadditive (respectively subadditive) if for all $x, y \in X$,

$$\varphi(x + y) \geqslant \varphi(x) \underset{\cdot}{+} \varphi(y) \quad (\text{respectively } \varphi(x + y) \leqslant \varphi(x) \dot{+} \varphi(y)).$$

Let us start with a preliminary result.

LEMMA 6.1. *Let X be a vector space. Let $h, k : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and assume that $k(0) = 0$. Then we have*

$$h = h \bigtriangleup k \iff h(x) \geqslant h(y) \dot{+} k(x-y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X$$

$$\iff h(y) \leqslant h(x) \dot{+} (-k_-)(y-x) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X$$

$$\iff h = h \bigtriangledown (-k_-).$$

As a consequence, the function k is superadditive if and only if $k = k \bigtriangleup k$, which is, in turn, equivalent to $k = k \bigtriangledown (-k_-)$.

Proof. If $h = h \bigtriangleup k$, then the definition of $h \bigtriangleup k$ entails that $h(x) \geqslant h(y) \dot{+} k(x-y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Conversely, if this inequality holds true for every $x, y \in X$, we have

$$h(x) \geqslant \sup_{y \in X} h(y) \dot{+} k(x-y) \geqslant h(x) + k(0) = h(x),$$

for every $x \in X$. This implies that $h(x) = (h \bigtriangleup k)(x)$ for every $x \in X$ and the first equivalence is proved.

For the second equivalence, observe that for all $x, y \in X$,

$$h(x) \geqslant h(y) \dot{+} k(x-y) \iff$$

$$h(y) \leqslant h(x) \dot{+} (-k)(x-y) = h(x) \dot{+} (-k_-)(y-x).$$

The proof of the third equivalence follows the same lines as the first one. For the last assertion, observe that k is superadditive if and only if $k(x) \geqslant k(y) \dot{+} k(x-y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. It suffices then to use what precedes with $h = k$. □

Through the above lemma, the following theorem provides, in particular, various characterizations of the class $\mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ when φ is superadditive.

THEOREM 6.1. *Let X be a vector space. Let $\varphi : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a superadditive function satisfying $\varphi(0) = 0$.*

(a) *For a function $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the following assertions are equivalent:*
   - (i) $g \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$;
   - (ii) $g = g \bigtriangleup \varphi$;
   - (iii) $g(x) \geqslant g(y) \dot{+} \varphi(x-y)$ *for all* $x, y \in X$;
   - (iv) $g(y) \leqslant g(x) \dot{+} (-\varphi_-)(y-x)$ *for all* $x, y \in X$;
   - (v) $g = g \bigtriangledown (-\varphi_-)$;
   - (vi) $-g \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$.

(b) *For every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $f \bigtriangledown (-\varphi_-)$ is the greatest φ-envelope that is majorized by f, while $f \bigtriangleup \varphi$ is the lowest φ-envelope that is minorized by f.*

(c) *The following inclusion holds true: $\mathcal{E}^{-\varphi} \subset \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$.*

Proof. (a) Let us assume that $g \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$. Then there exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g = f^{\varphi} = (-f) \vartriangle \varphi$. Using the superadditivity of φ and the last assertion of Lemma 6.1, we have

$$g \vartriangle \varphi = ((-f) \vartriangle \varphi) \vartriangle \varphi = (-f) \vartriangle (\varphi \vartriangle \varphi) = (-f) \vartriangle \varphi = g.$$

This shows that (i) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii). Conversely, if $g = g \vartriangle \varphi$ then $g = (-g)^{\varphi}$ and clearly $g \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$. The equivalences (ii) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iii) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iv) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (v) follow directly from Lemma 6.1. For the equivalence (v) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (vi), observe that

$$g = g \triangledown (-\varphi_-) \iff -g = (-g) \vartriangle \varphi_-,$$

and invoke the equivalence (i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (ii).

(b) Let $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and take $g = f \triangledown (-\varphi_-) = -f^{\varphi_-}$. By using the implication (vi) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii) in (a), we obtain $g = g \vartriangle \varphi$, thus implying that $g = (f^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi}$. Hence, $f \triangledown (-\varphi_-)$ coincides with $(f^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi}$, which is by property (6) the greatest element of $\mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ that is majorized by f. Replacing f (respectively φ) with $-f$ (respectively φ_-) and taking the opposite, we deduce that $f \vartriangle \varphi$ is the lowest element of $-\mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$ that is minorized by f. It suffices then to recall that $\mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-} = -\mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$, see the equivalence (i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (vi) in (a).

(c) Since $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$, we have $-\varphi \in -\mathcal{E}^{\varphi} = \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$. In view of Proposition 3.2(iii), we infer that $\mathcal{E}^{-\varphi} \subset \mathcal{E}^{\varphi_-}$. □

Example 6.1. Assume that $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed space. For $k \geqslant 0$ and $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, take $\varphi = -k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}$. Observe that for all $x, y \in X$,

$$\|x + y\|^{\alpha} \leqslant (\|x\| + \|y\|)^{\alpha} \leqslant \|x\|^{\alpha} + \|y\|^{\alpha}. \tag{40}$$

It ensues that the function $\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}$ is subadditive, hence φ is superadditive. From Theorem 6.1(a), we deduce that

$$f \in \mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}} \iff f(x) \geqslant f(y) - k\|x - y\|^{\alpha} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X. \tag{41}$$

By reversing the roles of x and y, we immediately obtain

$$f \in \mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}} \iff f(x) \leqslant f(y) + k\|x - y\|^{\alpha} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X. \tag{42}$$

If $f(y) = +\infty$ (respectively $f(y) = -\infty$) for some $y \in X$, we deduce from (41) (respectively (42)) that $f = \omega_X$ (respectively $f = -\omega_X$). On the other hand, if the function f is finite-valued, we infer from (41)–(42) that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leqslant k\|x - y\|^{\alpha}$ for all $x, y \in X$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}} \\
&\quad = \{f : X \to \mathbb{R},\, |f(x) - f(y)| \leqslant k\|x - y\|^{\alpha} \text{ for all } x, y \in X\} \cup \{\omega_X, -\omega_X\} \\
&\quad = \{f : X \to \mathbb{R},\, f \text{ is } \alpha\text{-Hölderian with constant } k\} \cup \{\omega_X, -\omega_X\}.
\end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 6.1(b), we deduce that $f \triangledown k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}$ (respectively $f \vartriangle (-k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha})$) is the greatest (respectively lowest) φ-envelope that is majorized (respectively minorized) by f. Since the map $\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}$ is even, Theorem 6.1(c) shows that $\mathcal{E}^{k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}} \subset \mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|^{\alpha}}$.

Now assume that $\alpha = 1$. From what precedes, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|} = \{f : X \to \mathbb{R},\ f \text{ is } k\text{-Lipschitz continuous}\} \cup \{\omega_X, -\omega_X\}.$$

The Pasch–Hausdorff regularization of f, defined by $l_k(f) = f \triangledown k\|\cdot\|$, is the greatest function of $\mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|}$ that is majorized by f. On the other hand, $f \vartriangle (-k\|\cdot\|)$ is the lowest function of $\mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|}$ that is minorized by f. The inclusion $\mathcal{E}^{k\|\cdot\|} \subset \mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|}$ shows that the $k\|\cdot\|$-envelopes are either k-Lipschitz continuous or equal to $\pm\omega_X$. The convexity of $\|\cdot\|$ implies that $k\|\cdot\|$-envelopes are also convex, therefore the inclusion $\mathcal{E}^{k\|\cdot\|} \subset \mathcal{E}^{-k\|\cdot\|}$ is strict. This ensures that the inclusion in (c) of the above theorem generally fails to be an equality.

As regards the function $\varphi = -k\|\cdot\|^\alpha$ it is also worth mentioning that, for $\eta(x, y) := \|x - y\|^\alpha$ with $\alpha > 0$ (even with more general coupling functions) and taking

$$\mathbf{\Phi} := \{r - \sigma\eta(\cdot, y) : r \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma > 0, y \in X\},$$

a lower semicontinuous function on the normed space X is shown in [**7**, Theorem 4.2] to be $\mathbf{\Phi}$-convex (i.e. a pointwise supremum of functions in $\mathbf{\Phi}$), whenever it is bounded from below by a function in $\mathbf{\Phi}$. The latter property with $\alpha = 2$ was previously proved in [**29**, Theorem 2]. The function $(x, y) \mapsto -k\|x - y\|^\alpha$ is also used as a particular important example of coupling functions arising in the framework of generalized conjugacy in many papers, see, for example, [**24**, p. 204].

Remark 6.1. Given a non-increasing convex function $\theta : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\theta(0) = 0$, one can easily check that the function $\theta(\|\cdot\|)$ is superadditive. Hence, the previous example can be generalized by taking $\varphi = \theta(\|\cdot\|)$.

Example 6.2. Let X be a vector space. Let $\Lambda \subset X$ be a set containing the origin and such that $\Lambda + \Lambda \subset \Lambda$. The function δ_Λ is clearly subadditive. This implies that the function $\varphi = -\delta_\Lambda$ is superadditive. By Theorem 6.1(a) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f \in \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_\Lambda} &\iff f(x) \geqslant f(y) \dotplus (-\delta_\Lambda)(x - y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X \\ &\iff f(x) \geqslant f(y) \quad \text{if } x - y \in \Lambda \\ &\iff f \text{ is } \Lambda\text{-non-decreasing.} \end{aligned}$$

This and Theorem 6.1(b) entail that $f \triangledown \delta_{-\Lambda}$ (respectively $f \vartriangle (-\delta_\Lambda)$) is the greatest (respectively lowest) Λ-non-decreasing function that is majorized (respectively minorized) by f. Further, Theorem 6.1(c) says that $\mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda} \subset \mathcal{E}^{(-\delta_\Lambda)_-} = \mathcal{E}^{-\delta_{-\Lambda}}$, hence the functions of $\mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda}$ are Λ-non-increasing. In fact, this can be recovered directly by using the characterization of $\mathcal{E}^{\delta_\Lambda}$ given by Proposition 4.4(ii).

§7. *Case* $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$.

7.1. *Expressions of* φ*-envelopes as Legendre–Fenchel conjugates.* Let us start with the following elementary lemma.

LEMMA 7.1. *Let* X *be a locally convex space. For every function* $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, *we have* $(f^*)_- = (f_-)^*$.

Proof. It suffices to use the definition of the Legendre–Fenchel conjugate. For every $\xi^* \in X^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(f^*)_-(\xi^*) = (f^*)(-\xi^*) &= \sup_{x\in X}\{\langle -\xi^*, x\rangle - f(x)\}\\ &= \sup_{y\in X}\{\langle \xi^*, y\rangle - f(-y)\}\\ &= \sup_{y\in X}\{\langle \xi^*, y\rangle - f_-(y)\} = (f_-)^*(\xi^*). \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

THEOREM 7.1. *Let* X *be a locally convex space. Let us assume that* $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$ *and let* $\psi : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ *be such that* $\psi^* = \varphi$. *Then we have for every function* $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$f^\varphi = (\psi \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^*. \tag{43}$$

Moreover, the following equivalences hold:

$$\begin{aligned} g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi &\iff g = (\psi \dot{-} h)^* \quad \textit{for some } h \in \Gamma(X^*)\\ &\iff g = (\psi \dot{-} (\psi \dot{-} g^*)^{**})^*.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For every $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} f^\varphi(x) &= \sup_{y\in X}\{\varphi(x-y) \,\dot{-}\, f(y)\}\\ &= \sup_{y\in X}\left\{\sup_{\xi^*\in X^*}\{\langle \xi^*, x-y\rangle - \psi(\xi^*)\} \,\dot{-}\, f(y)\right\} \quad \text{since } \varphi = \psi^*\\ &= \sup_{y\in X}\sup_{\xi^*\in X^*}\{\langle \xi^*, x-y\rangle - \psi(\xi^*) \,\dot{-}\, f(y)\}\\ &= \sup_{\xi^*\in X^*}\sup_{y\in X}\{\langle \xi^*, x-y\rangle - \psi(\xi^*) \,\dot{-}\, f(y)\}\\ &= \sup_{\xi^*\in X^*}\left\{\sup_{y\in X}\{\langle \xi^*, -y\rangle - f(y)\} \,\dot{-}\, \psi(\xi^*) + \langle \xi^*, x\rangle\right\}\\ &= \sup_{\xi^*\in X^*}\{f^*(-\xi^*) \,\dot{-}\, \psi(\xi^*) + \langle \xi^*, x\rangle\}\\ &= (\psi \dot{-} (f^*)_-)^*(x)\\ &= (\psi \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^*(x) \quad \text{in view of Lemma 7.1.}\end{aligned}$$

For the first equivalence, recall that $g \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ if and only if there exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g = f^{\varphi}$. Then use the equality $f^{\varphi} = (\psi \dot{-} (f_{-})^*)^*$ and the fact that the range of the Legendre–Fenchel transform is equal to $\Gamma(X^*)$, see, for example, [22].

For the second equivalence, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} g \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi} &\iff g = (g^{\varphi_-})^{\varphi} \\ &\iff g = [(\psi_- \dot{-} (g_-)^*)^*]^{\varphi} \quad \text{from formula (43)} \\ &\iff g = [((\psi \dot{-} g^*)^*)_-]^{\varphi} \quad \text{by Lemma 7.1} \\ &\iff g = (\psi \dot{-} (\psi \dot{-} g^*)^{**})^* \quad \text{from formula (43) again.} \end{aligned}$$ □

Remark 7.1. Since $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$ by assumption, we have $\varphi^{**} = \varphi$, hence we can take $\psi = \varphi^*$ in the statement of Theorem 7.1.

Remark 7.2. Formula (43) can be recovered partially by using a formula on the conjugate of the difference of functions. Recall that for $\psi : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $h \in \Gamma_0(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for all } x^* \in X^*, \quad (\psi \dot{-} h)^*(x^*) &= \sup_{y^* \in \operatorname{dom} h^*} \{\psi^*(x^* + y^*) - h^*(y^*)\} \\ &= (\psi^* \ominus h^*)(x^*). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

This formula is due to Hiriart-Urruty [11]. It was established first by Pshenichnyi [27], assuming that both ψ and h are finite-valued convex functions. Now let $\varphi \in \Gamma_0(X)$ and $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$. By reversing the roles of X and X^* and by using equality (44) with $h = (f_-)^*$ and $\psi : X^* \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that $\psi^* = \varphi$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^* &= \varphi \ominus (f_-)^{**} \\ &= \varphi \ominus f_- = f^{\varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we recover formula (43) in the case where both functions φ and f are in $\Gamma_0(X)$.

The next corollary says, in particular, that the φ-envelope of a function coincides with the φ-envelope of its lower semicontinuous convex hull whenever $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$.

COROLLARY 7.1. *Let X be a locally convex space and $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$. Then we have for every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and every function $g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying $\overline{\text{co}}\, f \leqslant g \leqslant f$,*

$$f^{\varphi} = (\overline{\text{co}}\, f)^{\varphi} = g^{\varphi}.$$

Proof. For the first equality, it suffices to use Theorem 7.1 and the fact that the functions f and $\overline{\text{co}}\, f$ have the same Legendre–Fenchel conjugate. On the other hand, since $\overline{\text{co}}\, f \leqslant g \leqslant f$, we see that $f^{\varphi} \leqslant g^{\varphi} \leqslant (\overline{\text{co}}\, f)^{\varphi}$. Recalling that $f^{\varphi} = (\overline{\text{co}}\, f)^{\varphi}$, the second equality immediately follows. □

For every set $D \subset X^*$, we define as in §3 the classes Σ_D and Σ_D^* by

$$\Sigma_D = \{f : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \operatorname{dom} f \subset D\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Sigma_D^* = \{f^*, f \in \Sigma_D\}.$$

In the same vein, let us define the classes $\widehat{\Sigma}_D$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}_D^*$ by

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_D = \{f : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \operatorname{dom} f = D\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widehat{\Sigma}_D^* = \{f^*, f \in \widehat{\Sigma}_D\}.$$

The following proposition allows us to characterize the classes $\widehat{\Sigma}_D^*$ and Σ_D^*.

PROPOSITION 7.1. *Let X be a locally convex space and let $D \subset X^*$ be such that $D = \{a_i^*, i \in I\}$ for some set I. Then for every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we have $f \in \widehat{\Sigma}_D^*$ (respectively Σ_D^*) if and only if there exists a family $(\alpha_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (respectively $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$) such that $f = \sup_{i\in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i$.*

Proof. Assume that $f \in \widehat{\Sigma}_D^*$ (respectively Σ_D^*). By definition, there exists $g : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $f = g^*$ and $\operatorname{dom} g = D$ (respectively $\operatorname{dom} g \subset D$). Hence, we have

$$f = \sup_{x^*\in D} \langle x^*, \cdot\rangle - g(x^*) = \sup_{i\in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle - g(a_i^*).$$

By setting $\alpha_i = -g(a_i^*)$ for every $i \in I$, we obtain $f = \sup_{i\in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (respectively $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$).

Conversely, assume that there exists $(\alpha_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (respectively $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$) such that $f = \sup_{i\in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sup_{x^*\in D} \left[\sup_{\{i\in I, a_i^* = x^*\}} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i \right] \\ &= \sup_{x^*\in D} \left[\langle x^*, \cdot\rangle + \sup_{\{i\in I, a_i^* = x^*\}} \alpha_i \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Defining the function $h : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ by

$$h(x^*) = \begin{cases} \sup_{\{i\in I, a_i^* = x^*\}} \alpha_i & \text{if } x^* \in D, \\ -\infty & \text{if } x^* \notin D, \end{cases}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sup_{x^*\in D} \langle x^*, \cdot\rangle + h(x^*) \\ &= \sup_{x^*\in X^*} \langle x^*, \cdot\rangle + h(x^*). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $f = (-h)^*$ with $\operatorname{dom}(-h) = D$ (respectively $\operatorname{dom}(-h) \subset D$), hence $f \in \widehat{\Sigma}_D^*$ (respectively $f \in \Sigma_D^*$). □

Example 7.1. Take $D = \{a_1^*, \ldots, a_n^*\} \subset X^*$ for some $n \geqslant 1$. The previous proposition shows that, for every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$f \in \Sigma_D^* \iff f = \sup_{i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i \quad \text{for some } \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}. \tag{45}$$

On the other hand, if $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$, the following equivalence holds true:

$$\operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D \iff \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset \{a_i^*\} \quad \text{for some } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

because the set $\operatorname{dom} f^*$ is convex. Since f^* is proper, this is, in turn, equivalent to $f^* = \delta_{\{a_i^*\}} - \alpha_i$ for some $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Taking the conjugate, we find $f = \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i$. It ensues that the set $\{f \in \Gamma_0(X), \operatorname{dom} f^* \subset D\}$ coincides with the set of affine continuous functions with slopes in $D = \{a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*\}$. This yields an example for which the inclusion (14) is strict. By applying again Proposition 7.1, we obtain that

$$f \in \Sigma^*_{\operatorname{co}(D)} \iff f = \sup_{x^* \in \operatorname{co}(D)} \langle x^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_{x^*}, \tag{46}$$

with $\alpha_{x^*} \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ for every $x^* \in \operatorname{co}(D)$. The comparison of (45) and (46) clearly shows that the inclusion $\Sigma_D^* \subset \Sigma^*_{\operatorname{co}(D)}$ is strict as soon as the set $D = \{a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*\}$ is not a singleton. This easily implies that the inclusion (15) is strict for such a set D.

The next result gives several upper bounds (in the sense of inclusion) for the set $\mathcal{E}^\varphi$, respectively when $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$, $\varphi \in \widehat{\Sigma}_D^*$ and $\varphi \in \Sigma_D^*$.

COROLLARY 7.2. *Let X be a locally convex space and let $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$.*

(i) *The following inclusions hold true:*

$$\mathcal{E}^\varphi \subset \bigcap_{\{\psi, \varphi = \psi^*\}} (\widehat{\Sigma}^*_{\operatorname{dom}\psi} \cup \{-\omega_X\}) \subset \bigcap_{\{\psi, \varphi = \psi^*\}} \Sigma^*_{\operatorname{dom}\psi}. \tag{47}$$

(ii) *For every subset $D \subset X^*$, we have*

$$\varphi \in \widehat{\Sigma}_D^* \iff \mathcal{E}^\varphi \subset \widehat{\Sigma}_D^* \cup \{-\omega_X\} \quad \textit{if } \varphi \neq -\omega_X,$$
$$\varphi \in \Sigma_D^* \iff \mathcal{E}^\varphi \subset \Sigma_D^*.$$

(iii) *Assume that there exist families $(a_i^*)_{i \in I} \subset X^*$ and $(\alpha_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (respectively $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$) such that*

$$\varphi = \sup_{i \in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i.$$

Then for every $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi \setminus \{-\omega_X\}$ (respectively $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$), there exists $(\beta_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (respectively $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$) such that

$$g = \sup_{i \in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \beta_i.$$

In particular, if the set I is finite, every φ-envelope is polyhedral.

Proof. (i) Let $\psi : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be such that $\varphi = \psi^*$. Assuming that $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, Theorem 7.1 shows that $g = (\psi \dot{-} h)^*$ for some $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$. If $h = -\omega_{X^*}$, we have $\psi \dot{-} h = \omega_{X^*}$ and therefore $g = -\omega_X$. If $h \neq -\omega_{X^*}$, we see that $\operatorname{dom}(\psi \dot{-} h) = \operatorname{dom}\psi$, hence $g \in \widehat{\Sigma}^*_{\operatorname{dom}\psi}$. We deduce the inclusion

$\mathcal{E}^\varphi \subset \widehat{\Sigma}^*_{\mathrm{dom}\,\psi} \cup \{-\omega_X\}$. Since this is true for every function $\psi : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\varphi = \psi^*$, the first inclusion of (47) follows. For the second inclusion, it suffices to note that $\widehat{\Sigma}^*_{\mathrm{dom}\,\psi} \cup \{-\omega_X\} \subset \Sigma^*_{\mathrm{dom}\,\psi}$.

(ii) Let us fix $D \subset X^*$ and assume that $\varphi \in \widehat{\Sigma}^*_D$. Then there exists $\psi : X^* \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\varphi = \psi^*$ and $\mathrm{dom}\,\psi = D$. We deduce from the first inclusion of (47) that

$$\mathcal{E}^\varphi \subset \widehat{\Sigma}^*_{\mathrm{dom}\,\psi} \cup \{-\omega_X\} = \widehat{\Sigma}^*_D \cup \{-\omega_X\}.$$

Conversely, if $\mathcal{E}^\varphi \subset \widehat{\Sigma}^*_D \cup \{-\omega_X\}$ and if $\varphi \neq -\omega_X$, then we obtain $\varphi \in \widehat{\Sigma}^*_D$ according to the inclusion $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. The proof of the second equivalence is analogous and left to the reader.

(iii) Let $(a_i^*)_{i\in I} \subset X^*$ and $(\alpha_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (respectively $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$) be such that $\varphi = \sup_{i\in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \alpha_i$. Let us set $D = \{a_i^*, i \in I\}$. Proposition 7.1 shows that $\varphi \in \widehat{\Sigma}^*_D$ (respectively Σ^*_D). If $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi \setminus \{-\omega_X\}$ (respectively $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$), we deduce from (ii) that $g \in \widehat{\Sigma}^*_D$ (respectively Σ^*_D). By applying Proposition 7.1 again, we derive the existence of $(\beta_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ (respectively $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$) such that $g = \sup_{i\in I} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + \beta_i$. Finally, if the set I is finite and if g is a φ-envelope, then either $g = \pm\omega_X$ or the function g is the supremum of a finite collection of continuous affine functions. We then conclude that g is polyhedral. □

By applying the second equivalence of Corollary 7.2(ii) with $D = X^*$, we obtain that $\varphi \in \Gamma(X)$ if and only if $\mathcal{E}^\varphi \subset \Gamma(X)$. Corollary 7.3 below shows that in this case the set $\mathcal{E}^\varphi$ is strictly included in $\Gamma(X)$. Note that for $\varphi \in \Gamma_0(X)$ satisfying a suitable condition (named generating condition), the functions of the class $\mathcal{E}^\varphi$ have been studied in [**25**] under the terminology of φ-strongly convex functions.

Following Theorem 7.1 and Remark 7.1, we have $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ if and only if $g = (\varphi^* \dot{-} h)^*$ for some $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$. Let us now have a look at the class of the functions equal to $(\varphi^* \dot{-} h)^*$ for some $h : X^* \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ not necessarily in $\Gamma(X^*)$.

PROPOSITION 7.2. *Let X be a locally convex space. Assume that $\varphi \in \Gamma_0(X)$ and $g \in \Gamma_0(X)$.*

(i) *If $g = (\varphi^* \dot{-} h)^*$ for some $h : X^* \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, then we have $g^\infty = \varphi^\infty$, which is equivalent to $\mathrm{cl}^{w*}(\mathrm{dom}\, g^*) = \mathrm{cl}^{w*}(\mathrm{dom}\,\varphi^*)$.*

(ii) *If $\mathrm{dom}\, g^* = \mathrm{dom}\,\varphi^*$, then $g = (\varphi^* \dot{-} h)^*$ for $h : X^* \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ given by $h = \varphi^* \dot{-} g^*$.*

Proof. (i) Assume that $g = (\varphi^* \dot{-} h)^*$ for some $h : X^* \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. By definition of the Legendre–Fenchel transform, we obtain

$$g = \sup_{\xi^*\in X^*} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + h(\xi^*) \dot{-} \varphi^*(\xi^*)\}$$
$$= \sup_{\xi^*\in \mathrm{dom}\,\varphi^*} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + h(\xi^*) - \varphi^*(\xi^*)\}. \tag{48}$$

Observe that the function h cannot take the value $+\infty$ on $\operatorname{dom}\varphi^*$ (otherwise we would have $g = \omega_X$). Therefore, the values $-\varphi^*(\xi^*)$ and $h(\xi^*)$ are finite for every $\xi^* \in \operatorname{dom}\varphi^*$. By taking the recession function of each member of (48), we obtain

$$g^\infty = \sup_{\xi^*\in\operatorname{dom}\varphi^*} [\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + h(\xi^*) - \varphi^*(\xi^*)]^\infty.$$

The recession function of the affine map $\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + h(\xi^*) - \varphi^*(\xi^*)$ is equal to $\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle$, thus implying that $g^\infty = \sup_{\xi^*\in\operatorname{dom}\varphi^*}\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle = \sigma_{\operatorname{dom}\varphi^*}$. Recalling that $\sigma_{\operatorname{dom}\varphi^*} = \varphi^\infty$, we deduce that $g^\infty = \varphi^\infty$, which is in turn equivalent to the equality $\mathrm{cl}^{w*}(\operatorname{dom} g^*) = \mathrm{cl}^{w*}(\operatorname{dom}\varphi^*)$, see [22].

(ii) Assume that $\operatorname{dom} g^* = \operatorname{dom}\varphi^*$. It is easy to check that for every $x^* \in X^*$,

$$(\varphi^* \dot{-} (\varphi^* \dot{-} g^*))(x^*) = \begin{cases} g^*(x^*) & \text{if } x^* \in \operatorname{dom} g^*, \\ +\infty & \text{if } x^* \notin \operatorname{dom} g^*. \end{cases}$$

It ensues that $\varphi^* \dot{-} (\varphi^* \dot{-} g^*) = g^*$. Since $g \in \Gamma_0(X)$ by assumption, we have $g = g^{**}$, hence $g = (\varphi^* \dot{-} (\varphi^* \dot{-} g^*))^*$. The function $h = \varphi^* \dot{-} g^*$ takes its values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ because $\operatorname{dom} g^* = \operatorname{dom}\varphi^*$. □

Combining Theorem 7.1 and Proposition 7.2, we derive a necessary (respectively sufficient) condition for a function $g \in \Gamma_0(X)$ to be a φ-envelope.

COROLLARY 7.3. *Let X be a locally convex space. Assume that $\varphi \in \Gamma_0(X)$ and $g \in \Gamma_0(X)$.*

(i) *If $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ then $g^\infty = \varphi^\infty$.*

(ii) *If* $\operatorname{dom} g^* = \operatorname{dom}\varphi^*$ *and* $\varphi^* \dot{-} g^* \in \Gamma_0(X^*)$, *then* $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$.

Proof. (i) If $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, we deduce from Theorem 7.1 that $g = (\varphi^* \dot{-} h)^*$ for some $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$. Since $g \in \Gamma_0(X)$ by assumption, we have $h \neq -\omega_{X^*}$, hence the function h does not take the value $-\infty$. Proposition 7.2(i) then implies that $g^\infty = \varphi^\infty$.

(ii) If $\operatorname{dom} g^* = \operatorname{dom}\varphi^*$, Proposition 7.2(ii) shows that $g = (\varphi^* \dot{-} h)^*$ with $h = \varphi^* \dot{-} g^*$. Since $h \in \Gamma_0(X^*)$ by assumption, we conclude by Theorem 7.1 that $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. □

7.2. *Klee envelopes.* Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space and let $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be an extended real-valued function. For any reals $\lambda > 0$ and $p \geqslant 1$, we define the Klee envelope of f with index λ and power p as

$$\kappa_{\lambda,p} f(x) = \sup_{y\in X}\left(\frac{1}{p\lambda}\|x - y\|^p - f(y)\right).$$

In other words, we have $\kappa_{\lambda,p} f = f^{\varphi}$ with the function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\varphi(x) = (1/p\lambda)\|x\|^p$. Applying Theorem 7.1 with $\varphi = (1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$ and denoting by $\|\cdot\|_{X^*}$ the dual norm on X^* we obtain the following result.

COROLLARY 7.4. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space. For any $\lambda > 0$, $p > 1$ and for every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we have*

$$\kappa_{\lambda,p} f = \left(\frac{\lambda^{q-1}}{q}\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - (f_-)^*\right)^*, \tag{49}$$

where $q > 1$ is the conjugate exponent of p. Moreover, the following assertions are equivalent:

(i) *g is a Klee envelope with index λ and power p;*
(ii) *$g = ((\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - h)^*$ for some $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$;*
(iii) *$g = ((\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - ((\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - g^*)^{**})^*$.*

These assertions are satisfied whenever the following stronger condition is fulfilled:

(iv) *$g \in \Gamma(X)$ and $(\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - g^* \in \Gamma(X^*)$.*

Proof. It suffices to apply Theorem 7.1 with $\varphi = (1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$ and $\psi = \varphi^* = (\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q$. Let us now establish the implication (iv) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii). Assume that $g \in \Gamma(X)$ and that $(\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - g^* \in \Gamma(X^*)$. The function g^* can be written as $g^* = (\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - h$ for some $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$. Since $g \in \Gamma(X)$ by assumption, we have $g = g^{**}$. Hence, we deduce that $g = ((\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - h)^*$ and assertion (ii) is proved. □

COROLLARY 7.5. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space. For every $p > 1$ and every $C \subset X$, the farthest distance function $\Delta_C = \sup_{y\in C}\|\cdot - y\|$ satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{p}\Delta_C^p = \left(\frac{1}{q}\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q - \sigma_{-C}\right)^*.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\kappa_{1,p}\delta_C = \sup_{y\in X}\left\{\frac{1}{p}\|\cdot - y\|^p - \delta_C(y)\right\} = \sup_{y\in C}\frac{1}{p}\|\cdot - y\|^p = \frac{1}{p}\Delta_C^p.$$

It suffices then to apply formula (49) of Corollary 7.4 with $f = \delta_C$ and $\lambda = 1$. □

Additional properties of the Klee envelopes can be obtained in the case when $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a Hilbert space and $p = 2$.

THEOREM 7.2. *Assume that X is a Hilbert space endowed with the scalar product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|$.*

(a) *For every* $\lambda > 0$ *and every function* $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, *we have*

$$\kappa_{\lambda,2} f = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\|\cdot\|^2 - (f_-)^*\right)^* \tag{50}$$

$$= \left(f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^*\left(-\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2; \tag{51}$$

$$\kappa_{\lambda,2}(\kappa_{\lambda,2} f) = \left(f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^{**} + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2. \tag{52}$$

(b) *For* $\lambda > 0$ *and* $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ *the following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) f *is a Klee envelope with index* λ *and power* 2*;*
(ii) $f = ((\lambda/2)\|\cdot\|^2 - h)^*$ *for some* $h \in \Gamma(X)$*;*
(iii) $f = ((\lambda/2)\|\cdot\|^2 - ((\lambda/2)\|\cdot\|^2 - f^*)^{**})^*$*;*
(iv) $f - (1/2\lambda)\|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma(X)$*;*
(v) $f \in \Gamma(X)$ *and* $(\lambda/2)\|\cdot\|^2 - f^* \in \Gamma(X)$.

Proof. (a) For the equality (50), it suffices to apply Corollary 7.4 with $p = 2$. For the equality (51), observe that for every $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\lambda,2} f(x) &= \sup_{y\in X}\left\{\frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x-y\|^2 - f(y)\right\}\\ &= \sup_{y\in X}\left\{\frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|y\|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda}\langle x, y\rangle - f(y)\right\}\\ &= \left(f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^*(-x/\lambda) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

By iterating we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_{\lambda,2}(\kappa_{\lambda,2} f) &= \left(\kappa_{\lambda,2} f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^*\left(-\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\\ &= \left[\left(f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^*\left(-\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right)\right]^*\left(-\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\\ &= \left(f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^{**} + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

which proves the equality (52).

(b) We now show that assertions (i) to (v) are equivalent. The equivalences (i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (ii) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iii) are consequences of Corollary 7.4 applied with $p = 2$. Let us show the equivalence (i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iv). Observe that f is a Klee envelope with index λ and power 2 if and only if $f \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ with $\varphi = (1/2\lambda)\|\cdot\|^2$. From the equivalence (7) $\Leftrightarrow$ (8) and the fact that $\varphi_- = \varphi$, this is, in turn, equivalent to

$f = (f^\varphi)^\varphi$. Since $(f^\varphi)^\varphi = \kappa_{\lambda,2}(\kappa_{\lambda,2} f)$ and using the equality (52), we infer that

$$f \text{ is a Klee envelope with index } \lambda \text{ and power } 2$$
$$\Updownarrow$$
$$f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2 = \left(f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^{**}$$
$$\Updownarrow$$
$$f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma(X).$$

Hence the equivalence (i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iv) is proved. Let us now show that (iv) $\Longrightarrow$ (v). If $f - (1/2\lambda)\|\cdot\|^2 = \pm\omega_X$, then assertion (v) is trivially satisfied. Hence we can assume that $f = (1/2\lambda)\|\cdot\|^2 + h$ with $h \in \Gamma_0(X)$. This clearly implies that $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$. Taking the conjugate, we obtain that $f^* = (\lambda/2)\|\cdot\|^2 \triangledown h^*$ since the classical qualification condition is satisfied. It ensues that for every $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(x) &= \inf_{y\in X}\left\{\frac{\lambda}{2}\|x-y\|^2 + h^*(y)\right\} \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x\|^2 + \inf_{y\in X}\left\{-\lambda\langle x, y\rangle + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|y\|^2 + h^*(y)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x\|^2 - f^*(x) &= \sup_{y\in X}\left\{\lambda\langle x, y\rangle - \frac{\lambda}{2}\|y\|^2 - h^*(y)\right\} \\ &= \left(h^* + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^*(\lambda x). \end{aligned}$$

This clearly implies that $(\lambda/2)\|\cdot\|^2 - f^* \in \Gamma_0(X)$ and (v) is proved. Let us finally observe that the implication (v) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii) has been established in Corollary 7.4. As a conclusion, we have shown the equivalences (i) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (ii) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iii) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (iv) along with the implications (iv) $\Longrightarrow$ (v) $\Longrightarrow$ (ii), which clearly establishes that all assertions (i) to (v) are equivalent. □

The equalities (51) and (52) have been previously established by Wang [**39**] respectively in Proposition 4.5 and at the end of the proof of Proposition 4.13. As noted in [**39**, Proposition 4.13] those equalities directly yield, for f proper and lower semicontinuous, that $\kappa_{\lambda,2}(\kappa_{\lambda,2} f) = f$ if and only if $f - (1/2\lambda)\|\cdot\|^2$ is convex.

Taking f as the indicator function of a set C gives the following corollary.

COROLLARY 7.6. *Assume that X is a Hilbert space. For every $C \subset X$, the farthest distance function Δ_C satisfies*

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta_C^2 = (\tfrac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|^2 - \sigma_{-C})^* = (\delta_{-C} - \tfrac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|^2)^* + \tfrac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|^2.$$

Proof. It suffices to apply formulas (50)–(51) of Theorem 7.2 with $f = \delta_C$ and $\lambda = 1$. □

7.3. *Case of a positively homogeneous function φ.* In this subsection, we assume that X is a locally convex space and that the function $\varphi \in \Gamma_0(X)$ is positively homogeneous, i.e. $\varphi = \sigma_D$ for a non-empty set $D \subset X^*$. By applying Theorem 7.1 with $\psi = \delta_D$, we immediately obtain the following result.

COROLLARY 7.7. *Let X be a locally convex space. Take $\varphi = \sigma_D$ for a non-empty set $D \subset X^*$. Then we have, for every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,*

$$f^\varphi = (\delta_D \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^* = \sup_{\xi^* \in D} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + f^*(-\xi^*)\}.$$

Moreover,

$$g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi \iff g = (\delta_D \dot{-} h)^* = \sup_{\xi^* \in D} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + h(\xi^*)\} \quad \textit{for some } h \in \Gamma(X^*)$$
$$\iff g = (\delta_D \dot{-} (\delta_D \dot{-} g^*)^{**})^*.$$

Let us now particularize to the case of a normed space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ and take $\varphi = \|\cdot\|$.

COROLLARY 7.8. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space. For every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we have*

$$\kappa_{1,1} f = (\delta_{\mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^* = \sup_{\xi^* \in \mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + f^*(-\xi^*)\}$$
$$= (\delta_{\mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^* = \sup_{\xi^* \in \mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + f^*(-\xi^*)\}.$$

Moreover,

g is a Klee envelope with index 1 and power 1

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$g = (\delta_{\mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \dot{-} h)^* = \sup_{\xi^* \in \mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + h(\xi^*)\} \quad \textit{for some } h \in \Gamma(X^*)$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$g = (\delta_{\mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \dot{-} (\delta_{\mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \dot{-} g^*)^{**})^*$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$g = (\delta_{\mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \dot{-} h)^* = \sup_{\xi^* \in \mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \{\langle \xi^*, \cdot\rangle + h(\xi^*)\} \quad \textit{for some } h \in \Gamma(X^*)$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$g = (\delta_{\mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \dot{-} (\delta_{\mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \dot{-} g^*)^{**})^*.$$

Proof. For the equalities $\kappa_{1,1} f = (\delta_{\mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^*$ and $\kappa_{1,1} f = (\delta_{\mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \dot{-} (f_-)^*)^*$, use Corollary 7.7 respectively with $D = \mathbb{B}_{X^*}$ and $D = \mathbb{S}_{X^*}$. The characterizations of Klee envelopes with index 1 and power 1 follow immediately. □

Assuming that $f = \delta_C$, we have

$$\kappa_{1,1}\delta_C = \sup_{x\in X}\{\|\cdot - x\| - \delta_C(x)\} = \sup_{x\in C} \|\cdot - x\| = \Delta_C,$$

where Δ_C is the farthest distance function. Taking into account the previous corollary, we then obtain

$$\Delta_C = (\delta_{\mathbb{B}_{X^*}} \dot{-} \sigma_{-C})^* = (\delta_{\mathbb{S}_{X^*}} \dot{-} \sigma_{-C})^*.$$

It is interesting to compare this expression with that of the signed distance sgd defined by $\text{sgd}(\cdot, C) := d(\cdot, C) - d(\cdot, X \setminus C)$, for which it is known that $\text{sgd}(\cdot, C) = (\delta_{\mathbb{S}_{X^*}} + \sigma_C)^*$, see [23].

Consider now the case of a finite set $D = \{a_1^*, \ldots, a_n^*\} \subset X^*$ for $n \geqslant 1$. By applying Corollary 7.7, we obtain the following result.

COROLLARY 7.9. *Let X be a locally convex space. Take $\varphi = \sigma_{\{a_1^*,\ldots,a_n^*\}}$ with $a_1^*, \ldots, a_n^* \in X^*$ and $n \geqslant 1$. Then we have, for every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$,*

$$f^\varphi = \sup_{i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + f^*(-a_i^*).$$

Moreover,

$$g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi \iff g = \sup_{i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}} \langle a_i^*, \cdot\rangle + h(a_i^*) \quad \text{for some } h \in \Gamma(X^*).$$

§8. *Case $\varphi \in -\Gamma(X)$.*

8.1. *Links between φ-envelopes and Legendre–Fenchel conjugates.*

PROPOSITION 8.1. *Let X be a locally convex space and let $\varphi, g : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be extended real-valued functions.*

(i) *If $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, then there exists $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$ such that $(-g)^* = (-\varphi)^* \dot{+} h$. If, in addition, $g \in -\Gamma(X)$, then $-g = ((-\varphi)^* \dot{+} h)^*$.*

(ii) *Assume that X is normed. If $\varphi \in -\Gamma(X)$ and if there exists $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$ satisfying the equality $-g = ((-\varphi)^* \dot{+} h)^*$ along with the condition $0 \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom} h - \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*)$, then $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$.*

Proof. (i) Since $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, there exists $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $g = f^\varphi$, hence $-g = (-\varphi) \triangledown f$ by (3). Taking the conjugate of each member, we find $(-g)^* = (-\varphi)^* \dot{+} f^*$. Hence, the expected equality holds with $h = f^* \in \Gamma(X^*)$. If, in addition, $g \in -\Gamma(X)$, we have $-g = (-g)^{**}$, hence we deduce from what precedes that $-g = ((-\varphi)^* \dot{+} h)^*$.

(ii) Assume that $-g = ((-\varphi)^* \dot{+} h)^*$ for some $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$. If $h = -\omega_{X^*}$ or if $(-\varphi)^* = -\omega_{X^*}$, then $-g = (-\omega_{X^*})^* = \omega_X$ and the inclusion $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ trivially holds. Now assume that $h \neq -\omega_{X^*}$ and $(-\varphi)^* \neq -\omega_{X^*}$. Since $0 \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom} h - \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*)$, the functions $(-\varphi)^*$ and h are proper and according to the fact that X^* is a Banach space, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -g &= (-\varphi)^{**} \triangledown h^* \\ &= (-\varphi) \triangledown h^* \quad \text{because } \varphi \in -\Gamma(X). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $g = \varphi \vartriangle (-h^*) = (h^*)^\varphi \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. □

COROLLARY 8.1. *Let X be a normed space and let $\varphi \in -\Gamma_0(X)$ be such that $\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* = X^*$. For every $g \in -\Gamma(X)$, the following equivalences hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned} g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi &\iff (-g)^* - (-\varphi)^* \in \Gamma(X^*) \\ &\iff -g = ((-\varphi)^* + h)^* \quad \textit{for some } h \in \Gamma(X^*). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix $g \in -\Gamma(X)$. Since $\operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^* = X^*$ and $-\varphi \in \Gamma_0(X)$, the function $(-\varphi)^*$ is finite-valued on X^*, so the implication

$$g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi \Longrightarrow h := (-g)^* - (-\varphi)^* \in \Gamma(X^*)$$

follows from Proposition 8.1(i). Recalling that $g \in -\Gamma(X)$, the right-hand inclusion implies in turn that $-g = ((-\varphi)^* + h)^*$.

Now assume that $-g = ((-\varphi)^* + h)^*$ for some $h \in \Gamma(X^*)$. If $\operatorname{dom} h \neq \emptyset$, the qualification assumption $0 \in \operatorname{int}(\operatorname{dom} h - \operatorname{dom}(-\varphi)^*)$ is automatically satisfied. We then deduce from Proposition 8.1(ii) that $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$. On the other hand, if $\operatorname{dom} h = \emptyset$, then we have $h = \omega_{X^*}$ and hence $-g = (\omega_{X^*})^* = -\omega_X$. Then the inclusion $g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$ trivially holds. □

8.2. *Moreau envelopes.* Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space and let $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be an extended real-valued function. For $\lambda > 0$ and $p \geqslant 1$, we define the Moreau envelope of f with index λ and power p as

$$e_{\lambda,p} f = \inf_{y \in X} \left(\frac{1}{p\lambda} \| \cdot - y \|^p + f(y) \right) = \frac{1}{p\lambda} \| \cdot \|^p \triangledown f.$$

Observe that $-e_{\lambda,p} f = (-(1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p) \vartriangle (-f) = f^\varphi$, with the function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\varphi = -(1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$. It ensues that g is a Moreau envelope with index λ and power p if and only if $-g \in \mathcal{E}^\varphi$, for $\varphi = -(1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$. By applying the results of the previous subsection with $\varphi = -(1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$, we obtain the following statement.

COROLLARY 8.2. *Assume that $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is a normed space. Let $\lambda > 0$, $p > 1$ and let q be the conjugate exponent of p.*

(i) *If g is a Moreau envelope with index λ and power p, then the function $g^* - (\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q \in \Gamma(X^*)$.*

(ii) *If moreover $g \in \Gamma(X)$, the following equivalences hold true:*

$$g \text{ is a Moreau envelope with index } \lambda \text{ and power } p$$
$$\Updownarrow$$
$$g^* - \frac{\lambda^{q-1}}{q}\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q \in \Gamma(X^*)$$
$$\Updownarrow$$
$$g = \left(\frac{\lambda^{q-1}}{q}\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q + h\right)^* \quad \text{for some } h \in \Gamma(X^*).$$

Proof. (i) It suffices to apply Proposition 8.1(i) with $\varphi = -(1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p$ and to recall that $((1/p\lambda)\|\cdot\|^p)^* = (\lambda^{q-1}/q)\|\cdot\|_{X^*}^q$.

(ii) The equivalences follow from Corollary 8.1 applied with

$$\varphi = -\frac{1}{p\lambda}\|\cdot\|^p. \qquad \square$$

When X is a Hilbert space, we obtain a more precise characterization of Moreau envelopes with power 2, as shown by the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 8.2. *Assume that X is a Hilbert space endowed with the scalar product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and the corresponding norm $\|\cdot\|$.*

(a) *For every $\lambda > 0$ and every function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, we have*

$$e_{\lambda,2}f = -\left(f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^*\left(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2. \tag{53}$$

The λ-proximal hull of f defined by $h_\lambda f = -e_{\lambda,2}(-e_{\lambda,2}f)$ is given by

$$-e_{\lambda,2}(-e_{\lambda,2}f) = \left(f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^{**} - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2. \tag{54}$$

(b) *A function $f : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is a Moreau envelope with index λ and power 2 if and only if $f - (1/2\lambda)\|\cdot\|^2 \in -\Gamma(X)$.*

Proof. (a) For every $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\lambda,2}f(x) &= \inf_{y\in X}\left\{\frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x-y\|^2 + f(y)\right\} \\ &= \inf_{y\in X}\left\{\frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|y\|^2 - \frac{1}{\lambda}\langle x, y\rangle + f(y)\right\} \\ &= -\left(f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^*(x/\lambda) + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|x\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the equality (53). By iterating we deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
-e_{\lambda,2}(-e_{\lambda,2}f) &= \left(-e_{\lambda,2}f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^* \left(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right) - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2 \\
&= \left[\left(f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^* \left(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right)\right]^* \left(\frac{\cdot}{\lambda}\right) - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2 \\
&= \left(f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^{**} - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

which proves the equality (54).

(b) Observe that f is a Moreau envelope with index λ and power 2 if and only if $-f \in \mathcal{E}^{\varphi}$ with $\varphi = -(1/2\lambda)\|\cdot\|^2$. From the equivalence (7) $\Leftrightarrow$ (8) and the fact that $\varphi_- = \varphi$, this is, in turn, equivalent to $-f = ((-f)^{\varphi})^{\varphi}$. Since $((-f)^{\varphi})^{\varphi} = -e_{\lambda,2}(-e_{\lambda,2}(-f))$ and using the equality (54), we infer that

$$
\begin{gathered}
f \text{ is a Moreau envelope with index } \lambda \text{ and power } 2 \\
\Updownarrow \\
-f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2 = \left(-f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2\right)^{**} \\
\Updownarrow \\
-f + \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2 \in \Gamma(X). \\
\Updownarrow \\
f - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\|\cdot\|^2 \in -\Gamma(X).
\end{gathered}
$$

□

The coupling functional $(x, y) \mapsto -(1/2\lambda)\|x - y\|^2$ was considered in [**7**, §5] in the framework of generalized conjugacy. Equalities (53)–(54) were established by Penot and Volle [**24**, p. 206] and Martinez-Legaz [**17**, pp. 182–184]. These equalities were also observed in [**30**, Example 11.26(c)] and [**39**, Lemma 3.3]. The characterization (b) above has been noted in the aforementioned references, and it amounts to the previous characterization in [**7**, p. 288] of Q^c-convex functions with $c := 1/(2\lambda)$. It seems that Moreau was the first who provided this characterization (b), see the equivalence (I) $\Leftrightarrow$ (III) in [**20**, Proposition 9.b].

References

1. H. Attouch, G. Buttazzo and G. Michaille, Variational analysis in Sobolev and BV spaces. In *Applications to PDE's and Optimization* (*MPS/SIAM Series on Optimization* **6**), Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM) (Philadelphia, PA, 2006).

2. A. Auslender and M. Teboulle, *Asymptotic Cones and Functions in Optimization and Variational Inequalities* (*Springer Monographs in Mathematics*), Springer (New York, 2003).

3. D. Aze and M. Volle, Various continuity properties of the deconvolution. In *Advances in Optimization* (*Lectures Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems* **382**), Springer (1992), 16–30.

4. E. J. Balder, An extension of duality-stability relations to nonconvex optimization problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **15** (1977), 329–343.

5. A. Brønsted and R. T. Rockafellar, On the subdifferentiability of convex functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **16** (1965), 605–611.

6. S. Dolecki, Polarities and generalized extremal convolutions. *J. Convex Anal.* **23** (2016), 603–614.
7. S. Dolecki and S. Kurcyusz, On Φ-convexity in extremal problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **16** (1978), 277–300.
8. I. Ekeland and R. Temam, Convex analysis and variational problems. In *SIAM Classics in Applied Mathematics* (*EkeTem* **28**), Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (Philadelphia, PA, 1999).
9. K.-H. Elster and A. Wolf, Recent results on generalized conjugate functions. In *Trends in Mathematical Optimization*, Birkhäuser (Basel, 1988), 67–78.
10. A. S. Granero, M. Jiménez-Sevilla and J. P. Moreno, Intersections of closed balls and geometry of Banach spaces. *Extracta Math.* **19**(1) (2004), 55–92.
11. J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty, A general formula on the conjugate of the difference of functions. *Canad. Math. Bull.* **29** (1986), 482–485.
12. J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty, The deconvolution operation in convex analysis: an introduction. *Cybernet. Systems Anal.* **30** (1994), 555–560.
13. J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty and C. Lemaréchal, Convex analysis and minimization algorithms, I. Fundamentals, II. In *Advanced Theory and Bundle Methods*, Springer (Berlin, 1993).
14. J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty and M.-L. Mazure, Formulations variationnelles de l'addition parallèle et de la soustraction parallèlle d'opérateurs semi-définis positifs. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. I* **302** (1986), 527–530.
15. G. E. Ivanov, Weak convexity of functions and the infimal convolution. *J. Convex Anal.* **23** (2016), 719–732.
16. A. Jourani, L. Thibault and D. Zagrodny, The NSLUC property and Klee envelope. *Math. Ann.* **365**(3–4) (2016), 923–967.
17. J.-E. Martinez-Legaz, Generalized conjugation and related topics. In *'Generalized Convexity and Fractional Programming with Economic Applications', Proc. Pisa. Italy (1988)* (*Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems* **345**) (ed. A. Cambini *et al*), Springer (Berlin, 1990), 168–197.
18. J.-E. Martinez-Legaz and J.-P. Penot, Regularization by erasement. *Math. Scand.* **98** (2006), 97–124.
19. S. Mazur, Über schwache Konvergentz in den Raumen L^p. *Studia Math.* **4** (1933), 128–133.
20. J. J. Moreau, Proximité et dualité dans un espace hilbertien. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **93** (1965), 273–299.
21. J. J. Moreau, Inf-convolution, sous-additivité, convexité des fonctions numériques. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **49** (1970), 109–154.
22. J. J. Moreau, Fonctionnelles convexes. In *Collège de France, Paris (1967)*, 2nd edn., Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche and Facoltá di Ingegneria Universita di Roma 'Tor Vergata' (2003).
23. J.-P. Penot, *Calculus Without Derivatives* (*Graduate Texts in Mathematics*), Springer (New York, 2013).
24. J.-P. Penot and M. Volle, On strongly convex and paraconvex dualities. In *'Generalized Convexity and Fractional Programming with Economic Applications', Proc. Pisa. Italy (1988)* (*Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems* **345**) (ed. A. Cambini *et al*), Springer (Berlin, 1990), 198–218.
25. E. S. Polovinkin, On strongly convex sets and strongly convex functions. *J. Math. Sci.* **100** (2000), 2633–2681.
26. E. S. Polovinkin and M. V. Balashov, *Elements of Convex and Strongly Convex Analysis*, Fizmatlit (Moscow, 2004) (Russian).
27. B. N. Pshenichnyi, Leçons sur les jeux différentiels. *Cah. l'I.R.I.A.*(4) (1971), 145–226.
28. R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ, 1970).
29. R. T. Rockafellar, Augmented Lagrange multipliers functions and duality in nonconvex programming. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **12** (1974), 268–285.
30. R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, Springer (Berlin, 1998).
31. A. Rubinov, *Abstract Convexity and Global Optimization*, Kluwer (Dordrecht, 2000).
32. I. Singer, Conjugation operators. In *Selected Topics in Operations Research and Mathematical Economics* (eds G. Hammer and D. Pallaschke), Springer (Berlin, 1984), 80–97.
33. I. Singer, Some Relations between Dualities, Polarities, Coupling Functionals, and Conjugations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **115** (1986), 1–22.
34. I. Singer, *Duality for Nonconvex Approximation and Optimization* (*CMS Books in Mathematics*), Springer (New York, 2006).
35. L. Vesely, Affine mappings and convex functions. Examples of convex functions. *Preprint*, available at http://www.mat.unimi.it/users/libor/AnConvessa/functions.pdf.
36. J.-P. Vial, Strong and weak convexity of sets and functions. *Math. Oper. Res.* **8** (1983), 231–259.
37. M. Volle, Contributions à la Dualité et à l'Épiconvergence. *Thèse de Doctorat d'État*, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, 1986.

38. M. Volle, A formula on the subdifferential of the deconvolution of convex functions. *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.* **47** (1993), 333–340.

39. X. Wang, On Chebyshev functions and Klee functions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **368** (2010), 293–310.

A. Cabot,
Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne,
UMR 5584,
CNRS,
Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté,
21000 Dijon,
France
E-mail: alexandre.cabot@u-bourgogne.fr

A. Jourani,
Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne,
UMR 5584,
CNRS,
Université Bourgogne Franche-Comté,
21000 Dijon,
France
E-mail: abderrahim.jourani@u-bourgogne.fr

L. Thibault,
Institut Montpelliérain Alexander Grothendieck,
Université de Montpellier,
Place Eugène Bataillon,
34095 Montpellier,
France

and

Centro de Modelamiento Matematico
Universidad de Chile, Chile
E-mail: lionel.thibault@univ-montp2.fr