

On the construction of maximal p -cyclically monotone operators

Orestes Bueno *

John Cotrina*

Abstract

In this paper we deal with the construction of explicit examples of maximal p -cyclically monotone operators. To date, there is only one instance of an explicit example of a maximal 2-cyclically monotone operator that is not maximal monotone. We present a systematic way to construct this kind of examples, along with several explicit examples.

Keywords: maximal p -cyclically monotone operators; p -cyclically monotone polar

MSC (2010): 47H04; 47H05; 49J53

1 Introduction

Let U, V be non-empty sets. A *multivalued operator* $T : U \rightrightarrows V$ is an application $T : U \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(V)$, that is, for $u \in U$, $T(u) \subset V$. The *domain*, *range* and *graph* of T are defined, respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(T) &= \{u \in U : T(u) \neq \emptyset\}, & \text{ran}(T) &= \bigcup_{u \in U} T(u) \\ \text{and } \text{gra}(T) &= \{(u, v) \in U \times V : v \in T(u)\}. \end{aligned}$$

A multivalued operator T is *finite* if its graph is a finite set. From now on, unless otherwise stated, we will identify multivalued operators with their graphs, so we will write $(u, v) \in T$ instead of $(u, v) \in \text{gra}(T)$.

Let V be a vector space. If $A \subset V$ then $\text{co}(A)$ denotes the *convex hull* of A . If $T : U \rightrightarrows V$ is a multivalued operator, the operator $T_{\text{co}} : U \rightrightarrows V$ is defined as $T_{\text{co}}(u) = \text{co}(T(u))$, for all $u \in U$.

Let X be a Banach space and X^* be its topological dual. The *duality product* $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : X \times X^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $\langle x, x^* \rangle = x^*(x)$. Given $C \subset X$ convex, the *normal cone operator* is the operator $N_C : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ defined as

$$N_C(x) = \{x^* \in X^* : \langle y - x, x^* \rangle \leq 0, \forall y \in C\},$$

*Universidad del Pacífico (Lima, Perú). Email: {o.buenotangoa, cotrina_je}@up.edu.pe

when $x \in C$ and $N_C(x) = \emptyset$, otherwise. In addition, the *recession cone* of C is the set

$$0^+C = \{d \in X : \forall x \in C, \forall t > 0, x + td \in C\}.$$

Given a cone $K \subset X$, the *polar cone* of K is the set

$$K^\circ = \{x^* \in X^* : \langle x, x^* \rangle \leq 0, \forall x \in K\}.$$

A multivalued operator $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ is called *monotone* if, for every pair $(x, x^*), (y, y^*) \in T$,

$$\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle \geq 0.$$

Moreover, T is *maximal monotone* if T is not properly contained in a monotone operator.

The notion of p -cyclical monotonicity was introduced by Rockafellar in [9] as a “midpoint” between classical monotonicity and cyclical monotonicity. A multivalued operator $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ is called *p -cyclically monotone*, with $p \in \mathbb{N}$, if

$$\{(x_i, x_i^*)\}_{i=0}^p \subset T \quad \longrightarrow \quad \sum_{i=0}^p \langle x_{i+1} - x_i, x_i^* \rangle \leq 0,$$

where $x_{p+1} = x_0$. An operator is called *cyclically monotone* if it is p -cyclically monotone, for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. As in the monotone case, we can consider *maximality* for p -cyclically monotone operators: a p -cyclically monotone operator is called *maximal p -cyclically monotone*, if its graph is not properly contained in the graph of another p -cyclically monotone operator.

Note that if T is a p -cyclically monotone operator, then it is q -cyclically monotone, for all $q \leq p$. Moreover, if T is maximal p -cyclically monotone and q -cyclically monotone, for some $q > p$, then it is also maximal q -cyclically monotone. In particular, a maximal monotone operator which is p -cyclically monotone, is also maximal p -cyclically monotone. Examples of these kinds of operators are the rotation matrices [1, 5]. So it is natural to ask if a maximal p -cyclically monotone operator is also maximal monotone. The answer was given, in the negative, by Bartz, Bauschke, Borwein, Reich and Wang in [2]. Bartz *et al.*, using Zorn’s Lemma, showed the existence of a maximal 2-cyclically monotone operator that is not maximal monotone. Later on, in [3], Bauschke and Wang constructed an explicit example of such an operator. This example has also the *bizarre* property of having a non-convex closed domain (in fact, its domain is the boundary of the unit diamond $|x| + |y| = 1$.)

Construction of maximal monotone operators was addressed previously by Crouzeix, Ocaña-Anaya and Sosa [6]. See also [11]. The goal of this work is to provide a way to construct explicit examples of maximal p -cyclically monotone operators. To do this, we use the recently defined *p -cyclically monotone polar* [4]. We also provide a way to deal with the equations that arise from the definition and the p -cyclical monotonicity of this kind of examples. Although the question

whether our method always provides maximal p -cyclically monotone operators remains open, we prove maximality of a certain family of examples, namely, operators that can be decomposed as the sum of a normal cone plus a union of perpendicular line segments in $X \times X^*$.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2, we provide several technical results that are needed later. In section 3, we describe a procedure that constructs explicit examples of p -cyclically monotone operators, starting from a finite p -cyclically monotone operator. In section 4, we present some computational subroutines that allow us to compute explicit examples and simplify their analysis. In section 5 we present four new examples: three maximal 2-cyclically monotone operators that are not maximal monotone (one with domain in \mathbb{R}^3) and a maximal 3-cyclically monotone operator which is not maximal 2-cyclically monotone.

2 Technical Results

The p -cyclically monotone polar [4] is an extension to the p -cyclically monotone case of the well known *monotone polar* [8]. The p -cyclically monotone polar (or simply, p -polar) of a multivalued operator $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ is the operator T^{μ_p} defined via its graph as

$$T^{\mu_p} = \left\{ (x_0, x_0^*) : \sum_{i=0}^p \langle x_{i+1} - x_i, x_i^* \rangle \leq 0, \forall \{(x_i, x_i^*)\}_{i=1}^p \subset T \text{ with } x_{p+1} = x_0 \right\}.$$

Proposition 2.1 ([4]). *Let $T, T_i : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ be multivalued operators and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. The following hold:*

1. $T^{\mu_{p+1}} \subset T^{\mu_p}$.
2. If $T_1 \subset T_2$ then $T_2^{\mu_p} \subset T_1^{\mu_p}$.
3. $\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} T_i \right)^{\mu_p} \subset \bigcap_{i \in I} T_i^{\mu_p}$. (Equality holds when $p = 1$)
4. The graph of T^{μ_p} is (strongly-)closed.
5. T is p -cyclically monotone if, and only if, $T \subset T^{\mu_p}$.
6. T is maximal p -cyclically monotone if, and only if, $T = T^{\mu_p}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ be a multivalued operator and let $C = \text{co}(\text{dom}(T))$. Then, for all $x_0 \in C \cap \text{dom}(T^{\mu_p})$*

$$0^+ T^{\mu_p}(x_0) = N_C(x_0).$$

Proof. Let $n^* \in N_C(x_0)$ and let $x_0^* \in T^{\mu_p}(x_0)$ and $t > 0$. Then, for every $\{(x_i, x_i^*)\}_{i=1}^p \subset T$, considering $x_{p+1} = x_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x_1 - x_0, x_0^* + tn^* \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^p \langle x_{i+1} - x_i, x_i^* \rangle \\ \leq \langle x_1 - x_0, x_0^* \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^p \langle x_{i+1} - x_i, x_i^* \rangle \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $n^* \in 0^+T^{\mu_p}(x_0)$. Conversely, consider $n^* \in 0^+T^{\mu_p}(x_0)$, that is, $x_0^* + tn^* \in T^{\mu_p}(x_0)$, for all $x_0^* \in T^{\mu_p}(x_0)$ and $t > 0$. Take $x_1 \in \text{dom}(T)$, $x_1^* \in T(x_1)$, and let $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_p$, $x_1^* = x_2^* = \dots = x_p^*$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \langle x_1 - x_0, x_0^* + tn^* \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \langle x_{i+1} - x_i, x_i^* \rangle + \langle x_0 - x_p, x_p^* \rangle \\ &= \langle x_1 - x_0, x_0^* + tn^* \rangle + \langle x_0 - x_1, x_1^* \rangle \\ &= \langle x_1 - x_0, x_0 - x_1^* \rangle + t \langle x_1 - x_0, n^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

If for some x_1 , $\langle x_1 - x_0, n^* \rangle > 0$, then taking $t \rightarrow +\infty$ in the previous inequality would lead to a contradiction. Therefore $\langle x_1 - x_0, n^* \rangle \leq 0$, for all $x_1 \in \text{dom}(T)$, and this implies that $n^* \in N_C(x_0)$. \square

Proposition 2.3. *Let $T : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ be a multivalued operator, and let $C = \text{co}(\text{dom}(T))$. Then*

$$T^{\mu_p}|_C \subset [T_{\text{co}} + N_C]^{\mu_p} \subset [T_{\text{co}} + N]^{\mu_p} \subset [T_{\text{co}}]^{\mu_p} \subset T^{\mu_p}.$$

where N is any operator such that $N \subset N_C$. In particular, for every $x \in C$,

$$[T_{\text{co}} + N_C]^{\mu_p}(x) = [T_{\text{co}} + N]^{\mu_p}(x) = [T_{\text{co}}]^{\mu_p}(x) = T^{\mu_p}(x).$$

Proof. Since $T \subset T_{\text{co}} \subset T_{\text{co}} + N \subset T_{\text{co}} + N_C$, from Proposition 2.1, item 2,

$$[T_{\text{co}} + N_C]^{\mu_p} \subset [T_{\text{co}} + N]^{\mu_p} \subset [T_{\text{co}}]^{\mu_p} \subset T^{\mu_p}.$$

Now, given any $(z_0, z_0^*) \in T^{\mu_p}$, with $z_0 \in C$, we aim to prove $(z_0, z_0^*) \in (T_{\text{co}} + N_C)^{\mu_p}$. Take $\{(z_j, z_j^* + n_j^*)\}_{j=1}^p \subset (T_{\text{co}} + N_C)$, that is,

$$n_j^* \in N_C(z_j) \text{ and } z_j^* = \sum_{l^j=1}^{r_j} \lambda_{j,l^j} x_{j,l^j}^*, \forall j = 1, \dots, p,$$

where $x_{j,l^j}^* \in T(z_j)$, $\lambda_{j,l^j} \geq 0$, for all $l^j = 1, \dots, r_j$, and $\sum_{l^j=1}^{r_j} \lambda_{j,l^j} = 1$. Therefore,

considering $n_0^* = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^p \langle z_{j+1} - z_j, z_j^* + n_j^* \rangle &\leq \sum_{j=0}^p \langle z_{j+1} - z_j, z_j^* \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^p \langle z_{j+1} - z_j, \sum_{l^j=1}^{r_j} \lambda_{j,l^j} x_{j,l^j}^* \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l^0=1}^{r_1} \cdots \sum_{l^p=1}^{r_p} \lambda_{0,l^0} \cdots \lambda_{p,l^p} \sum_{j=0}^p \langle z_{j+1} - z_j, x_{j,l^j}^* \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since $z_0 \in C$ and $\langle z_0 - z_p, z_p^* + n_p^* \rangle \leq \langle z_0 - z_p, z_p^* \rangle$.

Note that the sum $\sum_{j=0}^p \langle z_{j+1} - z_j, x_{j,l^j}^* \rangle \leq 0$, for every fixed choice of l^0, l^1, \dots, l^p .

Therefore, $T^{\mu_p}|_C \subset [T_{\text{co}} + N_C]^{\mu_p}$ and the first part of the proposition follows. The second part follows immediately. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{(w_i, w_i^*)\}_{i=1}^n$ be a p -cyclically monotone operator, and consider the operator*

$$S = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \text{co}\{(w_i, w_i^*), (w_{i+1}, w_{i+1}^*)\},$$

where $(w_{n+1}, w_{n+1}^*) = (w_1, w_1^*)$. If $\langle w_i - w_{i+1}, w_i^* - w_{i+1}^* \rangle = 0$ then S is p -cyclically monotone and $S^{\mu_p} = \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}$.

Proof. Define $(a_i(t), a_i^*(t)) = (1-t)(w_i, w_i^*) + t(w_{i+1}, w_{i+1}^*)$, for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus, S can be rewritten as

$$S = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{(a_i(t), a_i^*(t)) : t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Note that, for fixed i and t , since $\langle w_i - w_{i+1}, w_i^* - w_{i+1}^* \rangle = 0$,

$$\langle a_i(t), a_i^*(t) \rangle = \langle w_i, w_i^* \rangle + (\langle w_i, w_{i+1}^* \rangle - 2\langle w_i, w_i^* \rangle + \langle w_{i+1}, w_i^* \rangle)t \quad (1)$$

which is affine.

To prove that S is p -cyclically monotone we need to verify that

$$\sup_{\{(z_j, z_j^*)\}_{j=0}^p \subset S} \sum_{j=0}^p \langle z_{j+1} - z_j, z_j^* \rangle \leq 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\hat{\mu} = \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^p \langle a_{i_{j+1}}(t_{j+1}) - a_{i_j}(t_j), a_{i_j}^*(t_j) \rangle : i_j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, t_j \in [0, 1] \right\} \leq 0,$$

Since S is compact, the above supremum is attained, so there exist $\hat{i}_j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\hat{t}_j \in [0, 1]$, $j = 0, \dots, p$, such that

$$\hat{\mu} = \sum_{j=0}^p \langle a_{\hat{i}_{j+1}}(\hat{t}_{j+1}) - a_{\hat{i}_j}(\hat{t}_j), a_{\hat{i}_j}^*(\hat{t}_j) \rangle$$

Fixing $\hat{i}_0, \dots, \hat{i}_p$, because of (1), the function

$$\mu(t_0, \dots, t_p) = \sum_{j=0}^p \langle a_{\hat{i}_{j+1}}(t_{j+1}) - a_{\hat{i}_j}(t_j), a_{\hat{i}_j}^*(t_j) \rangle$$

is affine on each t_j separately. This implies that in

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu} &= \max_{t_0 \in [0,1]} \cdots \max_{t_p \in [0,1]} \mu(t_0, \dots, t_p) \\ &= \max_{t_0 \in [0,1]} \cdots \max_{t_p \in [0,1]} \sum_{j=0}^p \langle a_{\hat{i}_{j+1}}(t_{j+1}) - a_{\hat{i}_j}(t_j), a_{\hat{i}_j}^*(t_j) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

each maximization is attained when either $t_j = 0$ or $t_j = 1$. Therefore $(a_{\hat{i}_j}(\hat{t}_j), a_{\hat{i}_j}^*(\hat{t}_j)) \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $j = 0, \dots, p$ and thus, $\hat{\mu} \leq 0$, since \mathcal{F} is p -cyclically monotone by hypothesis.

Let $(z_0, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu} &= \sup_{\{(z_j, z_j^*)\}_{j=1}^p \subset S} \sum_{j=0}^p \langle z_{j+1} - z_j, z_j^* \rangle \\ &= \sup \left\{ \langle a_{i_1}(t_1) - z_0, z_0^* \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \langle a_{i_{j+1}}(t_{j+1}) - a_{i_j}(t_j), a_{i_j}^*(t_j) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle z_0 - a_{i_p}(t_p), a_{i_p}^*(t_p) \rangle : i_j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, t_j \in [0, 1] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

In the same way as before, the previous supremum is attained, and the values of t_j which maximize such expression are either 0 or 1. Therefore, for some $\{(y_i, y_i^*)\}_{i=1}^p \subset \mathcal{F}$,

$$\tilde{\mu} = \sum_{j=0}^p \langle y_{j+1} - y_j, y_j^* \rangle,$$

where $(y_0, y_0^*) = (z_0, z_0^*)$. Since $(z_0, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}$, we obtain $\tilde{\mu} \leq 0$, and the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let S be a p -cyclically monotone operator, $a \in \text{dom}(S^{\mu_p})$ and consider $T = (\{a\} \times S^{\mu_p}(a)) \cup S$. Then, T is also p -cyclically monotone.*

Proof. First, we will prove that T is monotone. Indeed, given $(b, b^*), (c, c^*) \in T$, let $M = \langle b - c, b^* - c^* \rangle$,

- if both $b = c = a$ then $M = 0$,
- if $b = a$ and $c \neq a$, then $M \geq 0$, since $(c, c^*) \in S$ and $(a, b^*) \in S^{\mu_p}$,
- if $b, c \neq a$ then $M \geq 0$, since S is p -cyclically monotone.

Now let $1 < r \leq p$. Assume that T is j -cyclically monotone, for every $1 \leq j < r$. We aim to prove that T is also r -cyclically monotone.

Take $\{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=0}^r \subset T$. If $\{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=0}^r \subset S$, then we are done. Otherwise, without loss of generality we may assume that $z_0 = a$, so $z_0^* \in S^{\mu_p}(a)$. If the remaining $z_i, i = 1, \dots, r$ are different from a then

$$\sum_{i=0}^r \langle z_{i+1} - z_i, z_i^* \rangle \leq 0$$

since $(z_0, z_0^*) \in S^{\mu_p} \subset S^{\mu_r}$. Otherwise, there exists $k \neq 0$ such that $z_k = a$, so the sum

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \langle z_{i+1} - z_i, z_i^* \rangle + \sum_{i=k}^r \langle z_{i+1} - z_i, z_i^* \rangle \leq 0$$

since both sums are associated to the finite sets $\{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=0}^{k-1}$ and $\{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=k}^r$ and T is already assumed to be $(k-1)$ and $(r-k)$ -cyclically monotone. \square

The following results deal with finite operators.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{F} : X \rightrightarrows X^*$ be a finite multivalued operator. Given $p \geq 2$ and $z_0 \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{F}^{\mu_p})$, the set $\mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}(z_0)$ is a polyhedron and, given $z_0^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}(z_0)$, it is defined by either*

1. *at most $\#\text{dom}(\mathcal{F}) \cdot \#\text{ran}(\mathcal{F})$ inequalities, each one linear in terms of either z_0 or z_0^* ; or*
2. *at most $\#\text{dom}(\mathcal{F})$ inequalities, each one linear in terms of z_0^* .*

Proof. By definition, $z_0^* \in \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}(z_0)$ if, and only if,

$$\sum_{i=0}^p \langle z_{i+1} - z_i, z_i^* \rangle \leq 0, \forall \{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=1}^p \subset \mathcal{F}, \quad (2)$$

considering $z_{p+1} = z_0 \in C$. This implies that $\mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}(z_0)$ is a polyhedron, as it is a finite intersection of half-spaces. Let $Z = \{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=1}^p \subset \mathcal{F}$. Note that the inequality in (2) is equivalent to

$$N(Z) \leq \langle z_0 - z_1, z_0^* - z_p^* \rangle. \quad (3)$$

where $N(Z) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \langle z_{i+1} - z_i, z_i^* \rangle + \langle z_1 - z_p, z_p^* \rangle$. Denote $\tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*)$ as the maximum over all the points $(z_2, z_2^*), \dots, (z_{p-1}, z_{p-1}^*) \in \mathcal{F}$ and all $z_1^* \in \mathcal{F}(z_1)$, $z_p \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(z_p^*)$. Thus,

$$\tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*) := \max \left\{ N(Z) : \begin{array}{l} \{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=2}^{p-1} \subset \mathcal{F} \\ z_1^* \in \mathcal{F}(z_1), z_p \in \mathcal{F}^{-1}(z_p^*) \end{array} \right\} \quad (4)$$

and from (3) we deduce

$$\tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*) \leq \langle z_0 - z_1, z_0^* - z_p^* \rangle.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\langle z_0 - z_1, z_0^* \rangle \geq \tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*) + \langle z_0 - z_1, z_p^* \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Note that the last inequality only depends on z_0, z_1 and z_p^* . Therefore, for fixed z_0 , any inequality generated by an arbitrary choice of $\{(z_i, z_i^*)\}_{i=1}^p$ would be exactly as, or implied by, inequality (5). Item 1 of the proposition follows by observing that there are at most $\#\text{dom}(\mathcal{F})$ choices of z_1 and $\#\text{ran}(\mathcal{F})$ choices of z_p^* . Note that inequality (5) is linear in terms of both z_0 and z_0^* separately.

Finally, in the same way as before, let $\tilde{M}(z_0, z_1)$ be the maximum of (5) over all possible $z_p^* \in \text{ran}(\mathcal{F})$, that is,

$$\tilde{M}(z_0, z_1) = \max \{ \tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*) + \langle z_0 - z_1, z_p^* \rangle : z_p^* \in \text{ran}(\mathcal{F}) \}. \quad (6)$$

Therefore (5) is exactly as, or implied by,

$$\tilde{M}(z_0, z_1) \leq \langle z_0 - z_1, z_0^* \rangle. \quad (7)$$

Item 2 follows by observing that there are at most $\#\text{dom}(\mathcal{F})$ choices for z_1 in (7) and that (7) is linear in terms of z_0^* . \square

Remark 2.7. When the elements of \mathcal{F} have small integer components, the quantities $\tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*)$ and $\tilde{M}(z_0, z_1)$ can be exactly computed using any programming language. See Section 4 for such an implementation.

Lemma 2.8 (Farkas). *Let A be a $m \times n$ matrix and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The system $Ax \geq b$ if, and only if,*

$$\forall y \geq 0, A^\top y = 0 \implies \langle b, y \rangle \leq 0.$$

Corollary 2.9. *Let \mathcal{F} and \tilde{M} defined as in the Proposition 2.6, and assume $\text{dom}(\mathcal{F}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Then $z_0 \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{F}^{\mu_p})$ if, and only if, for all $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \geq 0$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$ and $z_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \tilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \leq 0.$$

Proof. Let $z_0 \in X$. The system of inequalities (7) can be written in the form $A(z_0) \cdot z_0^* \geq b(z_0)$, where

$$A(z_0) = [z_0 - x_1, \dots, z_0 - x_n]^\top, \quad b(z_0) = (\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_1), \dots, \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_n)).$$

Now let $y = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, with $\lambda_i \geq 0$, but not all zero, then

$$A(z_0)^\top y = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \right) z_0 - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i = \sigma \left(z_0 - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i}{\sigma} x_i \right)$$

where $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i > 0$. We thus have proved that $A(z_0)^\top y = 0$ if, and only if, $z_0 \in \text{co}(\text{dom}(\mathcal{F}))$ and the weighted components of y are the coefficients associated to z_0 as a convex combination of x_i 's. The corollary follows by using Farkas' Lemma on system (7) and observing that

$$\langle b(z_0), y \rangle = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i).$$

□

Corollary 2.10. *Let \mathcal{F} be defined as in Proposition 2.6. Then*

$$X \setminus \text{co}(\text{dom}(\mathcal{F})) \subset \text{dom}(\mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}).$$

3 The algorithm

From now on, X will denote a real Hilbert space and we will identify X^* with X . Let $T_0 = \{(x_i, x_i^*)\}_{i=1}^n$ be a p -cyclically monotone operator. Consider, for $k = 1, \dots, n$, the following sequence of operators:

$$T_k = (\{x_k\} \times T_{k-1}^{\mu_p}(x_k)) \cup T_{k-1}.$$

and $T_{n+1} = T_n^{\mu_p}$. Note that, for $k = 1, \dots, n$,

$$T_k = \bigcup_{j=1}^k (\{x_j\} \times T_{j-1}^{\mu_p}(x_j)) \cup \{(x_j, x_j^*)\}_{j=k+1}^n.$$

Lemma 2.5 implies that T_k , for each $k = 1, \dots, n$, is p -cyclically monotone.

From now on, consider $C = \text{co}(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$. Note that C is convex and closed.

Proposition 3.1. *The following hold:*

1. T_1, \dots, T_n are p -cyclically monotone.

2. For each $k = 1, \dots, n$, $T_{k-1}^{\mu_p}(x_k)$ is a polyhedron, so it can be written as

$$T_{k-1}^{\mu_p}(x_k) = \text{co}(E_k) + N_C(x_k)$$

for some finite set E_k .

3. Let $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{k=1}^n \{x_k\} \times E_k$. Then

$$T_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^n \{x_k\} \times (\text{co}(E_k) + N_C(x_k)) = \mathcal{F}_{\text{co}} + N_C. \quad (8)$$

4. $\text{dom}(T_{n+1}) \subset C$.

5. $T_{n+1}(x_k) = T_n(x_k)$, for all $k = 1, \dots, n$.

6. $T_{n+1} = \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}|_C$

Proof. 1. It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.5.

2. The set $T_0^{\mu_p}(x_1)$ is a polyhedron since T_0 is a finite set and by Proposition 2.6. Let $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ and assume that $T_{j-1}^{\mu_p}(x_j)$ is a polyhedron, for all $j < k$. Let $E_j \subset T_{j-1}^{\mu_p}(x_j)$ be a finite set such that $T_{j-1}^{\mu_p}(x_j) = \text{co}(E_j) + N(x_j)$, where, in view of Lemma 2.2,

$$N(x_j) = N_C(x_j) = 0^+[T_{j-1}^{\mu_p}(x_j)], \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k-1,$$

and consider $E_j = \{x_j^*\}$ and $N(x_j) = \{0\}$, for $j = k, \dots, n$. Thus we can write

$$T_{k-1} = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \{x_j\} \times (\text{co}(E_j) + N(x_j)),$$

that is $T_{k-1} = F_{\text{co}} + N$, where $F = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \{x_j\} \times E_j$ is a finite set and $N \subset N_C$.

By Proposition 2.3,

$$T_{k-1}^{\mu_p}(x_k) = F^{\mu_p}(x_k),$$

which is a polyhedron, since F is finite.

3. It follows from item 2.

4. Let $x \in \text{dom}(T_{n+1})$ and let $x^* \in T_{n+1}(x) = T_n^{\mu_p}(x) \subset T_n^{\mu_1}(x)$. Therefore, for every (y, y^*) in T_n ,

$$\langle x - y, x^* - y^* \rangle \geq 0.$$

In particular, for any $j = 1, \dots, n$, take $t > 0$, $x_j^* \in T_n(x_j)$ and $n_j^* \in 0^+T_n(x_j) = 0^+T_{j-1}^{\mu_p}(x_j) = N_C(x_j)$, thus $x_j^* + tn_j^* \in T_n(x_j)$, and

$$\langle x - x_j, x^* - (x_j^* + tn_j^*) \rangle \geq 0 \iff \langle x - x_j, x^* - x_j^* \rangle \geq t \langle x - x_j, n_j^* \rangle,$$

for all $t > 0$. This implies that $\langle x - x_j, n_j^* \rangle \leq 0$, for all $n_j^* \in N_C(x_j)$, that is $x - x_j \in N_C(x_j)^\circ = T_C(x_j)$. Therefore, $x \in x_j + T_C(x_j)$, for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. Using Theorem 2.15 in [3], we conclude that

$$x \in \bigcap_{j=1}^n (x_j + T_C(x_j)) = C.$$

5. Since T_n is p -cyclically monotone and $T_{n+1} = T_n^{\mu_p}$, then $T_n(x_k) \subset T_{n+1}(x_k)$. On the other hand, since $T_{k-1} \subset T_n$,

$$T_{n+1}(x_k) = T_n^{\mu_p}(x_k) \subset T_{k-1}^{\mu_p}(x_k) = T_k(x_k) = T_n(x_k).$$

6. This is a consequence of equation (8) and Proposition 2.3. □

Remark 3.2. By item 6 in the previous proposition, given $x \in C$, $T_{n+1}(x)$ is a polyhedron. Moreover, Proposition 2.6 states that $T_{n+1}(x)$ can be defined by at most n linear inequalities, when $p \geq 2$, or by at most $\#\mathcal{F}$ inequalities, when $p = 1$.

Let $s = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let S_n be the simplex $S_n = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda \geq 0, \langle \lambda, s \rangle = 1\}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$, $C = \text{co}(\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$ and let $F : S_n \rightarrow C$ be defined as $F(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$. Then F is an open map, that is, if $U \subset S_n$ is open in S_n , then $F(U)$ is open in C .*

Proof. The points in $X \times \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$(x_1, e_1), \dots, (x_n, e_n)$$

are affinely independent, where e_1, \dots, e_n are the canonical vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . Thus, $\hat{F} : S_n \rightarrow \text{co}\{(x_i, e_i)\}$ is a bijective continuous function between compact sets, hence an homeomorphism. The lemma follows by observing that the projection $\Pi_1 : \text{co}\{(x_i, e_i)\} \rightarrow C$, $\Pi_1(x, y) = x$, is open and that $F = \Pi_1 \circ \hat{F}$. □

Proposition 3.4. *$\text{dom}(T_{n+1})$ is closed.*

Proof. Let $z_0 \in C$, $z_0 \notin \text{dom}(T_{n+1})$, and let \mathcal{F} be as in Proposition 3.1, item 3. Using Corollary 2.9 applied to \mathcal{F} , there exists $\lambda_0 \in S_n$ such that $z_0 \in F(\lambda_0)$ and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(F(\lambda_0), x_i) > 0.$$

Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is continuous, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for all $\lambda \in B(\lambda_0, \delta) \cap S_n$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda) > 0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.3, F is an open map, so there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B(z_0, \varepsilon) \cap C \subset F(B(\lambda_0, \delta) \cap S_n)$. This implies that, for all $z \in B(z_0, \varepsilon) \cap C$, there exists $\lambda \in B(\lambda_0, \delta) \cap S_n$ such that $z = F(\lambda)$ and, thus, $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\lambda) > 0$, that is $z \notin \text{dom}(T_{n+1})$. The proposition then follows. \square

4 Computational Tools

In this section we present some of the code we used to obtain the explicit formulas of operators T_n and T_{n+1} . We used *Maxima*, version 5.41.0, which is an open source symbolic algebra program.

First, we need some preliminary subroutines.

```
/* xc : extracts the "x" component of pts=[x,xs] */
xc(pts) := part(pts,makelist(i, i, 1, length(pts)/2))$
/* xsc : extracts the "xs" component of pts=[x,xs] */
xsc(pts) :=
  part(pts,makelist(i, i, length(pts)/2 + 1, length(pts)))$

/* xl : extracts the "x" component of a list
   ptsl=[x1,xs1], ..., [xn,xsn] */
xl(ptsl) := makelist(xc(ptsl[i]), i, 1, length(ptsl))$
/* xsl : extracts the "xs" component of a list
   ptsl=[x1,xs1], ..., [xn,xsn] */
xsl(ptsl) := makelist(xsc(ptsl[i]), i, 1, length(ptsl))$
```

The procedure `tuples` creates a list of all N -tuples of elements in the list S . This procedure was extracted from [10].

```
tuples(S, N):=block([K, counter, i, res, j],
  K:length(S),
  counter:create_list(1, i, 1, N),
  res:create_list(S[counter[i]], i, 1, N),
  for i:1 thru K^N-1 do (
    counter[1]:counter[1]+1,
    for j:1 thru N-1 do (
      if counter[j]>K then (
        counter[j]:1,
        counter[j+1]:counter[j+1]+1
      )
    )
  )
  else(
    return
```

```

    )
    ),
    res:=append(res, [create_list(S[counter[i]],i,1,N)])
    ),
    res
) $

```

4.1 Testing for p -cyclical monotonicity

The procedure `sump` computes the cyclic sum

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r-1} \langle x_{k+1} - x_k, x_k^* \rangle + \langle x_1 - x_r, x_r^* \rangle$$

of a list of points $[[x_1, x_1^*], \dots, [x_r, x_r^*]]$.

```

sump(cyc):=block([x,xs,r],
/*
  cyc : list of points (x,x^*) to be sumed
  must be in the form [[x[1],xs[1]],...,[x[r],xs[r]]]
*/
x:x1(cyc), /* x = [x[1],x[2],...,x[r]] */
xs:xsl(cyc), /* xs = [xs[1],xs[2],...,xs[r]] */
r:length(cyc), /* length of the cycle */
/* output */
sum( (x[k+1]-x[k]).xs[k] ,k,1,r-1)+(x[1]-x[r]).xs[r]
) $

```

The procedure `ispmono` computes the maximum of the sums of all the p -cycles of a finite operator \mathcal{F} . In this way, it determines if \mathcal{F} is a p -cyclically monotone operator.

```

ispmono(opF,p):=block([cyclist,cyc,maxsum,out],
/*
  opF : list of points of operator \mathcal{F}
  must be in the form [[x1,xs1],...,[xn,xsn]]
*/
cyclist:tuples(opF,p+1), /* list of all p-cycles in F */
maxsum:-inf,
for cyc in cyclist do(
  maxsum:max(maxsum,sump(cyc))
),
if maxsum<=0 then out:true else out:false,
[out,maxsum] /* output */
) $

```

Remark 4.1. Since *Maxima* supports symbolic arithmetic, the previous procedure not only provides an exact output when the input operator \mathcal{F} has integer components, but also when \mathcal{F} contains fractions, integer roots and certain constants (e.g., e and π).

4.2 \tilde{N} and \tilde{M} implementations

To implement $\tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*)$ we first need two additional subroutines: given a finite operator \mathcal{F} , the procedures `image` and `imageinv` compute $\mathcal{F}(z_1)$ and $\mathcal{F}^{-1}(z_p^*)$, respectively, for given $z_1 \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{F})$ and $z_p^* \in \text{ran}(\mathcal{F})$.

```
image(opF, z1) := block([z1slist, i],
/*
opF : list of points of operator \mathcal{F}
      must be in the form [[x1, xs1], ..., [xn, xsn]]
z1 : point in dom(F)
*/
  z1slist:[],
  for i:1 thru length(opF) do (
    if z1=xc(opF[i]) then
      z1slist:append(z1slist, [xsc(opF[i])])
  ),
  z1slist /* output F(z1) as a list */
)$

imageinv(opF, zps) := block([z1slist, i],
/*
opF : list of points of operator \mathcal{F}
      must be in the form [[x1, xs1], ..., [xn, xsn]]
zps : point in ran(F)
*/
  zplist:[],
  for i:1 thru length(opF) do (
    if zps=xsc(opF[i]) then
      zplist:append(zplist, [xc(opF[i])])
  ),
  zplist /* output F^{-1}(zps) as a list */
)$
```

We now present implementations of $\tilde{N}(z_1, z_p^*)$ and $\tilde{M}(z_0, z_1)$, as they appear in equations (4) and (6), respectively.

```
Ntilde(opF, z1, zps, p) := block(
[z1slist, zplist, zls, zp, pcyc, partpcyc],
  z1slist:image(opF, z1),
  zplist:imageinv(opF, zps),
  Zp:tuples(opF, p-2),
  maxsum:-inf,
  for zls in z1slist do(
    for zp in zplist do(
      for partpcyc in Zp do(
        pcyc:append( [flatten([z1, zls])],
                     partpcyc,
                     [flatten([zp, zps])]) ),
        maxsum:max(maxsum, sump(pcyc))
      )
    )
  )
```

```

    )
  )
),
factor(ratsimp(maxsum)) /* output (simplified) */
)$

Mtilde(opF, z0, z1, p) := block([ranF, maxsum, zps],
  ranF:unique(xsl(opF)),
  maxsum:-inf,
  for zps in ranF do(
    maxsum:max(maxsum, Mtilde(opF, z1, zps, p) + (z0-z1).zps)
  ),
  factor(ratsimp(maxsum)) /* output (simplified) */
)$

```

4.3 Using *Maxima* symbolic algebra features

The subroutines implemented in this section make use of *Maxima*'s symbolic features.

The procedure `polareqs` computes the system of inequalities in (7). This procedure accepts a finite operator \mathcal{F} and a point $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as inputs, and returns the list of inequalities that define $\mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}(z_0)$, when $p \geq 2$. The inequalities appear in terms of undetermined variables of the form $Y[1], \dots, Y[d]$. Note that the input point z_0 can also be undetermined, when this is the case, `polareqs` returns the full system of inequalities that satisfy any $(z_0, z_0^*) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}$.

```

polareqs(opF, z0, p) := block([eqs, domF, z0s, z1],
/*
opF : list of points of operator \mathcal{F}
      must be in the form [[x1,xs1],...,[xn,xsn]]
z0 : input point
p : order of cyclicity, must be at least two
z0s : generic point in F(z0)
*/
  z0s:makelist(Y[i],i,length(z0)),
  domF:unique(xl(opF)),
  eqs:[],
  for z1 in delete(z0,domF) do(
    eqs:append(eqs,[Mtilde(opF,z0,z1,p)<=(z0-z1).z0s])
  ),
  eqs /* output */
)$

```

The following procedure was extracted from [7]. It computes the extreme points of a polyhedron defined by a list of inequalities.

```

ext(apr) := block([var, fs, cs, ap, s, S, m],
  load(simplex),
  var:sort(listofvars(apr)),

```

```

s:apply("+",var),
fs:append([1,s,-s],var,-var),
ap(k):=subst(apr[k]=(lhs(apr[k])=rhs(apr[k])),apr),
cs:makelist(ap(k),k,1,length(apr)),
S:[],
for f in fs do
  for c in cs do (
    m:minimize_lp(f,c),
    if listp(m) then
      S:cons(subst(m[2],var),S)
  ),
listify(setify(S))
)$

```

The procedure `operatorTn` computes the finite operator \mathcal{F} as in Proposition 3.1, item 3. The procedure takes as input the operator $T_0 = \{(x_i, x_i^*)\}_{i=1}^n$ and proceeds in the following way: \mathcal{F} starts as T_0 and, for each x_k in $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$,

- using `polareqs`, it computes the equations that define $T_k(x_k)$;
- using `ext`, it computes E_k , the extreme points of $T_k(x_k)$;
- then it deletes (x_k, x_k^*) from \mathcal{F} ;
- and finally, it adds $\{x_k\} \times E_k$ to \mathcal{F} .

```

operatorTn(opT0,p):=block([opF,domT0,xk,Tkxkeqs,Ek,ptk,zv],
/*
opT0 : list of points of initial points {(x_i,x_i^*)},
      must be in the form [[x1,xs1],...,[xn,xsn]]
*/
opF:opT0,
domT0:x1(opT0),
for xk in domT0 do(
  Tkxkeqs:polareqs(opF,xk,p), /* equations of T_k(xk) */
  Ek:unique(ratsimp(ext(Tkxkeqs))), /* vertices E_k */
  for ptk in opF do(
    if xk=xc(ptk) then(
      opF:delete(ptk,opF)
    )
  ), /* deletion of (xk,xs) from F */
  for zv in Ek do(
    opF:append(opF,[flatten([xk,zv])])
  ) /* addition of xk \times Ek to F */
),
opF /* output */
)$

```

5 Examples

In this section we present many different explicit examples of maximal p -cyclically monotone operators. First, a little outline of our procedure is given. For each example we present the *starting points* $(x_1, x_1^*), \dots, (x_n, x_n^*)$ and, using the algorithm given in the Section 3 and the implementation of $\widetilde{M}(z_0, z_1)$ given in Section 4, we present the *second to last operator* T_n , the operator \mathcal{F} and the equations that any $(z_0, z_0^*) \in T_{n+1}, T_{n+1}$ being the *last step operator*, must satisfy. Following that we try to obtain the domain and correspondence rule of T_{n+1} . In most cases, we make use of Corollary 2.9 to obtain a candidate for $\text{dom}(T_{n+1})$. Finally, we prove that T_{n+1} is p -cyclically monotone, which implies that it is maximal p -cyclically monotone.

5.1 Bauschke and Wang original example

Consider the starting points:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= (1, 0), & x_1^* &= (0, 1), \\ x_2 &= (0, 1), & x_2^* &= (-1, 0), \\ x_3 &= (-1, 0), & x_3^* &= (-1, -2), \\ x_4 &= (0, -1), & x_4^* &= (0, -1). \end{aligned}$$

After the first four steps of our algorithm, we obtain the following images of x_1, \dots, x_4 :

$$\begin{aligned} T_4(x_1) &= \{(u, v) : u + 1 \geq |v|, u \geq 0\} \\ &= \text{co}\{(0, -1), (0, 1)\} + \text{cone co}\{(1, -1), (1, 1)\}, \\ T_4(x_2) &= \{(u, v) : v \geq |u + 1|\} \\ &= (-1, 0) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1), (-1, 1)\}, \\ T_4(x_3) &= \{(u, v) : u \leq -|v + 1|, u \leq -1\} \\ &= \text{co}\{(-1, 0), (-1, -2)\} + \text{cone co}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}, \\ T_4(x_4) &= \{(u, v) : v \leq -|u| - 1\} \\ &= (0, -1) + \text{cone co}\{(-1, -1), (1, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{F} = \{(y_i, y_i^*)\}_{i=1}^6$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &= (1, 0) & y_1^* &= (0, -1), & y_2 &= (1, 0) & y_2^* &= (0, 1), \\ y_3 &= (0, 1) & y_3^* &= (-1, 0), & y_4 &= (-1, 0) & y_4^* &= (-1, 0), \\ y_5 &= (-1, 0) & y_5^* &= (-1, -2), & y_6 &= (0, -1) & y_6^* &= (0, -1), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (-1, 0), (0, -1)\}, \\ \text{ran}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(0, 1), (0, -1), (-1, 0), (-1, -2)\}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Example from Bauschke and Wang [3]

We now consider $z_0 = (x, y)$ and $z_0^* = (u, v)$, and follow the steps of the proof of Proposition 2.6, so we obtain the set of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{1 - x, -x - 2y - 1, -y, y\} &\leq (x - 1)u + yv, \\ \max\{-x, -x - 2y - 2, -y - 1, y - 1\} &\leq xu + (y - 1)v, \\ \max\{-x - 2, -x - 2y, -y - 1, y - 1\} &\leq (x + 1)u + yv, \\ \max\{-x - 1, -x - 2y - 1, -y, y - 2\} &\leq xu + (y + 1)v. \end{aligned}$$

These inequalities were obtained and handled by Bauschke and Wang in [3]. They were able to prove that the last step operator T_5 is defined on $\{(x, y) : |x| + |y| = 1\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} T_5(x_i) &= T_4(x_i), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \\ T_5(1 - t, t) &= (-t, 1 - t) + \text{cone}\{(1, 1)\}, \\ T_5(-t, 1 - t) &= (-1, 0) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}, \\ T_5(-1 + t, -t) &= (t - 1, t - 2) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, \\ T_5(t, t - 1) &= (0, -1) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

See Figure 1 for a partial graphical representation of the domain and range of T_5 .

5.2 A maximal 2-cyclically monotone operator in \mathbb{R}^3

Consider the starting points:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= (-1, -1, -1), & x_1^* &= (-8, -8, 16), \\ x_2 &= (1, 0, 0), & x_2^* &= (8, 12, 0), \\ x_3 &= (0, 1, 0), & x_3^* &= (-12, 8, 0), \\ x_4 &= (0, 0, 1), & x_4^* &= (0, 0, 16). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $C = \text{co}\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ forms a tetrahedron in \mathbb{R}^3 . After the first four steps, we obtain the following images of x_1, \dots, x_4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_4(x_1) &= \{(u, v, w) : 2u + v + w \leq 0, u + 2v + w \leq 4, u + v + 2w \leq 20\} \\ &= (-6, -2, 14) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, -3), (1, -3, 1), (-3, 1, 1)\}, \\ T_4(x_2) &= \{(u, v, w) : 2u + v + w \geq 4, v - u \leq 4, w - u \leq 16\} \\ &= (-4, 0, 12) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, 1), (1, -3, 1), (1, 1, -3)\}, \\ T_4(x_3) &= \{(u, v, w) : u + 2v + w \geq 4, v - u \geq 4, w - v \leq 12\} \\ &= (-5, -1, 11) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, 1), (-3, 1, 1), (1, 1, -3)\}, \\ T_4(x_4) &= \{(u, v, w) : u + v + 2w \geq 20, w - u \geq 16, w - v \geq 16\} \\ &= (-3, -3, 13) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, 1), (1, -3, 1), (-3, 1, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{F} = \{(y_i, y_i^*)\}_{i=1}^4$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &= (1, 0, 0), & y_1^* &= (-4, 0, 12), & y_2 &= (0, 1, 0), & y_2^* &= (-5, -1, 11), \\ y_3 &= (-1, -1, -1), & y_3^* &= (-6, -2, 14), & y_4 &= (0, 0, 1), & y_4^* &= (-3, -3, 13), \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1), (-1, -1, -1)\}, \\ \text{ran}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(-6, -2, 14), (-4, 0, 12), (-5, -1, 11), (-3, -3, 13)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now consider $z_0 = (x, y, z)$ and $z_0^* = (u, v, w)$, and follow the steps of the proof of Proposition 2.6, so we obtain the set of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 13z - 3y - 3x + 7 \\ 14z - 2y - 6x + 6 \\ 11z - y - 5x + 5 \\ 12z - 4x + 4 \end{array} \right\} &\leq (x+1)u + (y+1)v + (z+1)w, \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 11z - y - 5x + 5 \\ 12z - 4x + 4 \\ 13z - 3y - 3x + 3 \\ 14z - 2y - 6x + 2 \end{array} \right\} &\leq (x-1)u + yv + zw, \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 14z - 2y - 6x + 2 \\ 11z - y - 5x + 1 \\ 12z - 4x \\ 13z - 3y - 3x - 1 \end{array} \right\} &\leq xu + (y-1)v + zw, \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 12z - 4x - 12 \\ 13z - 3y - 3x - 13 \\ 14z - 2y - 6x - 14 \\ 11z - y - 5x - 15 \end{array} \right\} &\leq xu + yv + (z-1)w, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

together with the domain conditions

$$x + y + z \leq 1, \quad x + y - 3z \leq 1, \quad x - 3y + z \leq 1, \quad -3x + y + z \leq 1. \tag{10}$$

Using (10), it is straightforward to verify that the terms inside the maximums taken on the left hand side of inequalities (9) are in decreasing order, from top to bottom. Therefore

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_1) := 13z - 3y - 3x + 7 \leq (x+1)u + (y+1)v + (z+1)w, \quad (11)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_2) := 11z - y - 5x + 5 \leq (x-1)u + yv + zw, \quad (12)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_3) := 14z - 2y - 6x + 2 \leq xu + (y-1)v + zw, \quad (13)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_4) := 12z - 4x - 12 \leq xu + yv + (z-1)w. \quad (14)$$

To determine the domain of T_5 , recall that any $z_0 \in C$ can be uniquely written as

$$z_0 = \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i x_i = (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1, \alpha_3 - \alpha_1, \alpha_4 - \alpha_1),$$

with $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i = 1$. By Corollary 2.9, $z_0 \in \text{dom}(T_5)$ if, and only if,

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \leq 0.$$

This inequality, after replacing in the formulas for \widetilde{M} and considering $\alpha_1 = 1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4$, takes the form

$$\alpha_2(1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4) + \alpha_3\alpha_4 \leq 0,$$

that is,

$$\alpha_1\alpha_2 + \alpha_3\alpha_4 \leq 0.$$

Since $\alpha_i \geq 0$, for all i , the last inequality holds if, and only if, $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_3\alpha_4 = 0$. Therefore $z_0 \in \text{dom}(T_5)$ if, and only if,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 = 0 \wedge \alpha_4 = 0 & \iff z_0 \in [x_2, x_3] = [y_1, y_2], \\ \alpha_2 = 0 \wedge \alpha_4 = 0 & \iff z_0 \in [x_3, x_1] = [y_2, y_3], \\ \alpha_2 = 0 \wedge \alpha_3 = 0 & \iff z_0 \in [x_1, x_4] = [y_3, y_4], \\ \alpha_1 = 0 \wedge \alpha_3 = 0 & \iff z_0 \in [x_4, x_2] = [y_4, y_1]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, although $C = \text{co}\{x_i\}$ is a tetrahedron, the domain of T_5 are the segments

$$\text{dom}(T_5) = [y_1, y_2] \cup [y_2, y_3] \cup [y_3, y_4] \cup [y_4, y_1].$$

See Figure 2.

The operator T_5 coincides with T_4 at y_1, \dots, y_4 . We now deduce the formula for T_5 at the relative interior of each of the segments of the domain.




Figure 2: Domain of a maximal 2-cyclically monotone operator in \mathbb{R}^3

- $z_0 \in]y_1, y_2[\iff z_0 = (t, 1 - t, 0), t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (11) through (14), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (11) \quad & \text{implies} \quad u + 2v + w + t(u - v) \geq 4, \\
 (12) \quad & \text{implies} \quad (t - 1)(4 + u - v) \geq 0, \\
 (13) \quad & \text{implies} \quad t(4 + u - v) \geq 0, \\
 (14) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 12 + v + t(4 + u - v) \geq w.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $v - u = 4$ so $12 + v \geq w$, $u + 2v + w \geq 4 + 4t$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_5(t, 1 - t, 0) &= \{(u, v, w) : v - u = 4, v - w \geq -12, u + 2v + w \geq 4 + 4t\} \\
 &= (t - 5, t - 1, t + 11) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, -3), (1, 1, 1)\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

- $z_0 \in]y_2, y_3[\iff z_0 = (-t, 1 - 2t, -t), t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (11) through (14), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (11) \quad & \text{implies} \quad (t - 1)(u + 2v + w - 4) \leq 0, \\
 (12) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 4 + u + t(u + 2v + w - 4) \leq v, \\
 (13) \quad & \text{implies} \quad t(u + 2v + w - 4) \leq 0, \\
 (14) \quad & \text{implies} \quad w + t(u + 2v + w - 8) \leq 12 + v.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $u + 2v + w = 4$ so $4 + u \leq v$, $w - v \leq 12 + 4t$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_5(-t, 1 - 2t, -t) &= \{(u, v, w) : u + 2v + w = 4, v - u \geq 4, v - w \geq -12 - 4t\} \\
 &= (-5 - t, -1 - t, 11 + 3t) + \text{cone co}\{(-3, 1, 1), (1, 1, -3)\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

- $z_0 \in]y_3, y_4[\iff z_0 = (-t, -t, 1 - 2t), t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equa-

tions (11) through (14), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(11) \quad & \text{implies} \quad (t-1)(u+v+2w-20) \leq 0, \\
(12) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 16+u+t(u+v+2w-16) \leq w, \\
(13) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 16+v+t(u+v+2w-20) \leq w, \\
(14) \quad & \text{implies} \quad t(u+v+2w-20) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $u+v+2w=20$ so $16+u+4t \leq w$, $16+v \leq w$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5(-t, -t, 1-2t) &= \{(u, v, w) : u+v+2w=20, w-u \geq 16+4t, w-v \geq 16\} \\
&= (-3-3t, t-3, 13+t) + \text{cone co}\{(-3, 1, 1), (1, -3, 1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

- $z_0 \in]y_4, y_1[\iff z_0 = (t, 0, 1-t), t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (11) through (14), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(11) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 20+t(w-u-16) \leq u+v+2w, \\
(12) \quad & \text{implies} \quad (t-1)(16+u-w) \geq 0, \\
(13) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 16+v+t(w-u-20) \leq w, \\
(14) \quad & \text{implies} \quad t(16+u-w) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $w-u=16$ so $16+v-4t \leq w$, $u+v+2w \geq 20$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5(t, 0, 1-t) &= \{(u, v, w) : w-u=16, w-v \geq 16-4t, u+v+2w \geq 20\} \\
&= (-3-t, 3t-3, 13-t) + \text{cone co}\{(1, -3, 1), (1, 1, 1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the full correspondence rule of T_5 is

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5(-1, -1, -1) &= (-6, -2, 14) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, -3), (1, -3, 1), (-3, 1, 1)\}, \\
T_5(1, 0, 0) &= (-4, 0, 12) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, 1), (1, -3, 1), (1, 1, -3)\}, \\
T_5(0, 1, 0) &= (-5, -1, 11) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, 1), (-3, 1, 1), (1, 1, -3)\}, \\
T_5(0, 0, 1) &= (-3, -3, 13) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, 1), (1, -3, 1), (-3, 1, 1)\},
\end{aligned}$$

and, for all $t \in]0, 1[$,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5(t, 1-t, 0) &= (t-5, t-1, t+11) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1, -3), (1, 1, 1)\}, \\
T_5(-t, 1-2t, -t) &= (-5-t, -1-t, 11+3t) + \text{cone co}\{(-3, 1, 1), (1, 1, -3)\}, \\
T_5(-t, -t, 1-2t) &= (-3-3t, t-3, 13+t) + \text{cone co}\{(-3, 1, 1), (1, -3, 1)\}, \\
T_5(t, 0, 1-t) &= (-3-t, 3t-3, 13-t) + \text{cone co}\{(1, -3, 1), (1, 1, 1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

From the calculations above, we conclude that T_5 has the form

$$T_5 = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 \text{co}\{(y_i, y_i^*), (y_{i+1}, y_{i+1}^*)\} + N_C,$$

considering $(y_5, y_5^*) = (y_1, y_1^*)$. From Lemma 2.4, T_5 is 2-cyclically monotone and, since $T^5 = T_4^{\mu_2}$, T^5 is maximal 2-cyclically monotone.

5.3 A maximal 3-cyclically monotone operator

Consider the starting points:

$$\begin{array}{ll} x_1 = (1, 0), & x_1^* = (1, 1), \\ x_2 = (1, 1), & x_2^* = (0, 2), \\ x_3 = (0, 1), & x_3^* = (-1, 1), \\ x_4 = (-1, 0), & x_4^* = (-1, -1), \\ x_5 = (0, -1), & x_5^* = (1, -1). \end{array}$$

After the first five steps of our algorithm, we obtain the following images of x_1, \dots, x_4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_5(x_1) &= \{(u, v) : u \geq v, u + v \geq 0, v \leq 2\} \\ &= \text{co}\{(0, 0), (2, 2)\} + \text{cone co}\{(1, -1), (1, 0)\}, \\ T_5(x_2) &= \{(u, v) : u \geq 0, v \geq 2\} \\ &= (0, 2) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}, \\ T_5(x_3) &= \{(u, v) : 2 + u \leq v, u + v \geq 0, u \leq 0\} \\ &= \text{co}\{(0, 2), (-1, 1)\} + \text{cone co}\{(0, 1), (-1, 1)\}, \\ T_5(x_4) &= \{(u, v) : u \leq -1, u + v \leq 0, u \leq v\} \\ &= \text{co}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\} + \text{cone co}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}, \\ T_5(x_5) &= \{(u, v) : v \leq 0, v \leq u, u + v \leq 0\} \\ &= (0, 0) + \text{cone co}\{(-1, -1), (1, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{F} = \{(y_i, y_i^*)\}_{i=1}^8$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{llll} y_1 = (1, 0), & y_1^* = (0, 0), & y_2 = (1, 0), & y_2^* = (2, 2), \\ y_3 = (1, 1), & y_3^* = (0, 2), & y_4 = (0, 1), & y_4^* = (0, 2), \\ y_5 = (0, 1), & y_5^* = (-1, 1), & y_6 = (-1, 0), & y_6^* = (-1, 1), \\ y_7 = (-1, 0), & y_7^* = (-1, -1), & y_8 = (0, -1), & y_8^* = (0, 0), \end{array}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(1, 0), (1, 1), (0, 1), (-1, 0), (0, -1)\}, \\ \text{ran}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(0, 0), (2, 2), (0, 2), (-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now consider $z_0 = (x, y)$ and $z_0^* = (u, v)$, and follow the steps of the proof of

Proposition 2.6, so we obtain the set of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0, -y-x-1, 2y, \\ y-x+1, 2y+2x-2 \end{array} \right\} &\leq (x-1)u + yv, \\
\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -2, -y-x-1, 2y-2, \\ y-x-1, 2y+2x-4 \end{array} \right\} &\leq (x-1)u + (y-1)v, \\
\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0, -y-x-1, 2y-2, \\ y-x-1, 2y+2x-4 \end{array} \right\} &\leq xu + (y-1)v, \\
\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0, -y-x-1, 2y-2, \\ y-x-1, 2y+2x-2 \end{array} \right\} &\leq (x+1)u + yv, \\
\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0, -y-x-1, 2y, \\ y-x-1, 2y+2x-2 \end{array} \right\} &\leq xu + (y+1)v.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

In addition, we have the domain conditions:

$$x-1 \leq y \leq x+1, \quad -x-1 \leq y \leq 1, \quad x \leq 1.$$

These conditions allow us to further simplify the equations in (15):

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_1) := \max\{2y, y-x+1\} \leq (x-1)u + yv, \tag{16}$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_2) := \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -x-y-1 \\ 2y-2 \\ y-x-1 \end{array} \right\} \leq (x-1)u + (y-1)v, \tag{17}$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_3) := 0 \leq xu + (y-1)v, \tag{18}$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_4) := \max\{0, 2x+2y-2\} \leq (x+1)u + yv, \tag{19}$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_5) := \max\{0, 2y\} \leq xu + (y+1)v. \tag{20}$$

To determine the domain of T_6 , recall that any $z_0 \in C$ can be written as

$$z_0 = \sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i x_i = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_4, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_5),$$

with $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i = 1$.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ that is, $\alpha_4 = \alpha_5 = 0, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \geq 0$ and $z_0 = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3) = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, 1 - \alpha_1)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) &= (1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)0 + \alpha_1 \max\{2 - 2\alpha_1, 2 - 2\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_2 \max\{-\alpha_2 - 2, -2\alpha_1, -2\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\} \\
&= \alpha_1(2 - 2\alpha_1) + \alpha_2(-2\alpha_1) \\
&= 2\alpha_1(1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 > 0$. Since $z_0 = (x, y) = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, 1 - \alpha_1)$, we obtain $x = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 < 1$ and $y = 1 - \alpha_1 < 1$. Therefore, all $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ such that $x < 1$ and $y < 1$ do not belong to $\text{dom}(T_6)$.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_3, x_4\}$ that is, $\alpha_2 = \alpha_5 = 0, \alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 1, \alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_4 \geq 0$ and $z_0 = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4, \alpha_3) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4, 1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) &= \alpha_1 \max\{2(1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4), 2(1 - \alpha_1)\} \\ &\quad + (1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4)0 + \alpha_4 \max\{0, -4\alpha_4\} \\ &= 2\alpha_1(1 - \alpha_1) \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ if, and only if, $0 < \alpha_1 < 1$. Since $z_0 = (x, y) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4, 1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4)$, we obtain $0 < 2\alpha_1 = 1 + x - y < 2$. Therefore, all $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_3, x_4\}$ such that $x - 1 < y < x + 1$ do not belong to $\text{dom}(T_6)$.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_4, x_5\}$ that is, $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0, \alpha_1 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = 1, \alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha_5 \geq 0$ and $z_0 = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4, -\alpha_5) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_4 - 1)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) &= \alpha_1 \max\{2\alpha_4 - 2(1 - \alpha_1), 2\alpha_4\} \\ &\quad + \alpha_4 \max\{0, -4(1 - \alpha_1)\} \\ &\quad + (1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4) \max\{0, -2(1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4)\} \\ &= 2\alpha_1\alpha_4. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $\alpha_4 > 0$. Since $z_0 = (x, y) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_4 - 1)$, we obtain $2\alpha_1 = 1 + x + y > 0$ and $2\alpha_4 = 1 - x + y > 0$. Therefore, all $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_3, x_4\}$ such that $-y - 1 < x < y + 1$ do not belong to $\text{dom}(T_6)$.

In view of the above calculations, we obtain that

$$\text{dom}(T_6) \subset [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_2, x_3] \cup [x_3, x_4] \cup [x_4, x_5] \cup [x_5, x_1].$$

We now are going to prove the converse inclusion and, at the same time, find the correspondence rule of T_6 . This will be done in several parts.

- Let $z_0 \in]x_1, x_2[$, that is $z_0 = (1, t)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (16) through (20), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(16) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2 \leq v, \\
(17) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2 \geq v, \\
(18) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq u + (t - 1)v, \\
(19) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2t \leq 2u + tv, \\
(20) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2t \leq u + (t + 1)v.
\end{aligned}$$

That is $v = 2$ and $u \geq 2(1 - t)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6(1, t) &= \{(u, v) : v = 2, u \geq 2 - 2t\} \\
&= (2 - 2t, 2) + \text{cone}\{(1, 0)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_2, x_3[$, that is $z_0 = (1 - t, 1)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (16) through (20), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(16) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2 \leq -tu + v, \\
(17) \quad & \text{implies} \quad u \leq 0, \\
(18) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq u, \\
(19) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2(1 - t) \leq (2 - t)u + v, \\
(20) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2 \leq (1 - t)u + 2v.
\end{aligned}$$

That is $u = 0$ and $v \geq 2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6(1 - t, 1) &= \{(u, v) : u = 0, v \geq 2\} \\
&= (0, 2) + \text{cone}\{(0, 1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_3, x_4[$, that is $z_0 = (-t, 1 - t)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (16) through (20), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(16) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2 \leq -(t + 1)u + (1 - t)v, \\
(17) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq -(t + 1)u - tv, \\
(18) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \geq u + v, \\
(19) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq u + v, \\
(20) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2(1 - t) \leq -tu + (2 - t)v.
\end{aligned}$$

That is $v = -u$ and $u \leq -1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6(-t, 1 - t) &= \{(u, v) : v = -u, u \leq -1\} \\
&= (-1, 1) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_4, x_5[$, that is $z_0 = (t - 1, -t)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (16) through (20), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(16) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 2 - 2t \leq (t - 2)u - tv, \\
(17) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq (t - 2)u - (t + 1)v, \\
(18) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq (t - 1)u - (t + 1)v, \\
(19) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq u - v, \\
(20) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq -u + v.
\end{aligned}$$

That is $u = v$ and $u \leq t - 1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6(t - 1, -t) &= \{(u, v) : u = v, u \leq t - 1\} \\
&= (t - 1, t - 1) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_5, x_1[$, that is $z_0 = (t, t - 1)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (16) through (20), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(16) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq -u - v, \\
(17) \quad & \text{implies} \quad -2t \leq (t - 1)u + (t - 2)v, \\
(18) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq tu + (t - 2)v, \\
(19) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq (t + 1)u + (t - 1)v, \\
(20) \quad & \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq u + v.
\end{aligned}$$

That is $v = -u$ and $u \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6(t, t - 1) &= \{(u, v) : v = -u, u \geq 0\} \\
&= (0, 0) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\text{dom}(T_6) = [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_2, x_3] \cup [x_3, x_4] \cup [x_4, x_5] \cup [x_5, x_1],$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6(1, 0) &= \text{co}\{(0, 0), (2, 2)\} + \text{cone co}\{(1, -1), (1, 0)\}, \\
T_6(1, 1) &= (0, 2) + \text{cone co}\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}, \\
T_6(0, 1) &= \text{co}\{(0, 2), (-1, 1)\} + \text{cone co}\{(0, 1), (-1, 1)\}, \\
T_6(-1, 0) &= \text{co}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\} + \text{cone co}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}, \\
T_6(0, -1) &= (0, 0) + \text{cone co}\{(-1, -1), (1, -1)\},
\end{aligned}$$

and, for every $t \in]0, 1[$,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6(1, t) &= (2 - 2t, 2) + \text{cone}\{(1, 0)\}, \\
T_6(1 - t, 1) &= (0, 2) + \text{cone}\{(0, 1)\}, \\
T_6(-t, 1 - t) &= (-1, 1) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}, \\
T_6(t - 1, -t) &= (t - 1, t - 1) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, \\
T_6(t, t - 1) &= (0, 0) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: A maximal 3-cyclically monotone operator

See Figure 3 for a graphical representation of the domain and range of T_6 .

Note that T_6 can be written as

$$T_6 = S + N_C$$

where $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^8 \text{co}\{(y_i, y_i^*), (y_{i+1}, y_{i+1}^*)\}$, considering $(y_9, y_9^*) = (y_1, y_1^*)$. From Lemma 2.4, the operator T_6 is 3-cyclically monotone and, since $T_6 = T_5^{\mu_3}$, T_6 is maximal 3-cyclically monotone.

On the other hand, also from Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.3,

$$(0, 0) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mu_2}|_C = S^{\mu_2}|_C = (S + N_C)^{\mu_2} = T_6^{\mu_2}.$$

However $(0, 0) \notin T_6$. Therefore, T_6 is not maximal 2-cyclically monotone.

5.4 A perturbation of Bauschke and Wang's example

Consider the starting points:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= (1, 0), & x_1^* &= (0, 1), \\ x_2 &= (0, 1), & x_2^* &= (-1, 0), \\ x_3 &= (-1, 0), & x_3^* &= (-2, -2), \\ x_4 &= (0, -1), & x_4^* &= (0, -1). \end{aligned}$$

These points are the same as in Section 5.1, but considering $x_3^* = (-2, -2)$ instead of $(-1, -2)$.

After the first four steps of our algorithm, we obtain the following images of x_1, \dots, x_4 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_4(x_1) &= \{(u, v) : u \geq -1/2, -u - 1 \leq v \leq 1 + u\} \\
&= \text{co}\{(-1/2, -1/2), (-1/2, 1/2)\} + \text{cone co}\{(1, -1), (1, 1)\}, \\
T_4(x_2) &= \{(u, v) : v \geq 0, -v - 2 \leq u \leq v - 1\} \\
&= \text{co}\{(-1, 0), (-2, 0)\} + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1), (-1, 1)\}, \\
T_4(x_3) &= \{(u, v) : u \leq -3/2, u \leq v \leq -u - 2\} \\
&= \text{co}\{(-3/2, -1/2), (-3/2, -3/2)\} + \text{cone co}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}, \\
T_4(x_4) &= \{(u, v) : v \leq -1, v \leq u \leq -v - 1\} \\
&= \text{co}\{(-1, -1), (0, -1)\} + \text{cone co}\{(-1, -1), (1, -1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{F} = \{(y_i, y_i^*)\}_{i=1}^8$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
y_1 &= (1, 0), & y_1^* &= (-1/2, -1/2), & y_2 &= (1, 0), & y_2^* &= (-1/2, 1/2), \\
y_3 &= (0, 1), & y_3^* &= (-1, 0), & y_4 &= (0, 1), & y_4^* &= (-2, 0), \\
y_5 &= (-1, 0), & y_5^* &= (-3/2, -1/2), & y_6 &= (-1, 0), & y_6^* &= (-3/2, -3/2), \\
y_7 &= (0, -1), & y_7^* &= (-1, -1), & y_8 &= (0, -1), & y_8^* &= (0, -1),
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dom}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (-1, 0), (0, -1)\}, \\
\text{ran}(\mathcal{F}) &= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (-1/2, -1/2), (-1/2, 1/2), (-1, 0), (-2, 0), \\ (-3/2, -1/2), (-3/2, -3/2), (-1, -1), (0, -1) \end{array} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now consider $z_0 = (x, y)$ and $z_0^* = (u, v)$, and follow the steps of the proof of Proposition 2.6, so we obtain the set of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1 - 2x, 1 - x, -x - y, -y, \\ (y - x + 1)/2, -(x + y - 1)/2, \\ -(3x + y + 1)/2, -(3x + 3y + 1)/2 \end{array} \right\} \leq (x - 1)u + yv, \\
&\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -2x, -x, -y - 1, -y - x - 1, \\ (y - x - 1)/2, -(x + y + 1)/2, \\ -(3x + y - 1)/2, -(3x + 3y - 1)/2 \end{array} \right\} \leq xu + (y - 1)v, \\
&\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -x - 2, -2x - 2, -y - 1, -y - x - 1, \\ (y - x - 5)/2, -3(x + y + 1)/2, \\ -(x + y + 5)/2, -(3x + y + 3)/2 \end{array} \right\} \leq (x + 1)u + yv, \\
&\max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -x - 2, -2x - 2, -y - 1, -y - x - 1, \\ (y - x - 1)/2, -3(x + y + 1)/2, \\ -(x + y + 1)/2, -(3x + y + 3)/2 \end{array} \right\} \leq xu + (y + 1)v.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

In addition, we have the domain conditions:

$$x - 1 \leq y \leq x + 1, \quad -x - 1 \leq y \leq 1 - x,$$

which allow us to obtain from (21) the simplified inequalities:

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_1) := \max\{1 - 2x, 1 - x\} \leq (x - 1)u + yv, \quad (22)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_2) := \max\{(1 - 3x - 3y)/2, (1 - 3x - y)/2\} \leq xu + (y - 1)v, \quad (23)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_3) := \max\{-1 - y, -1 - x - y\} \leq (x + 1)u + yv, \quad (24)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_4) := \max\{(-1 - x - y)/2, (-1 - x + y)/2\} \leq xu + (y + 1)v. \quad (25)$$

To determine the domain of T_5 , let $z_0 \in C$ and write

$$z_0 = \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i x_i = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_3, \alpha_2 - \alpha_4),$$

with $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i = 1$. By Corollary 2.9, $z_0 \in \text{dom}(T_5)$ if, and only if,

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \leq 0.$$

The determination of $\text{dom}(T_5)$ will be done in several steps.

- $(0, 0) \in \text{dom}(T_5)$. It is enough to replace $(x, y) = (0, 0)$ on equations (22) through (25), so we obtain

$$1 \leq -u, \quad -1 \leq u, \quad 1/2 \leq -v, \quad -1/2 \leq v.$$

That is $(-1, -1/2) \in T_5(0, 0)$ and $(0, 0) \in \text{dom}(T_5)$

- $z_0 \in]x_1, x_3[$ that is $z_0 = \alpha_1(1, 0) + \alpha_3(-1, 0) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_3, 0)$, with $\alpha_1, \alpha_3 > 0$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 = 1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \\ &= \alpha_1 \max\{3 - 4\alpha_1, 2 - 2\alpha_1\} + (1 - \alpha_1) \max\{-1, -2\alpha_1\} \\ &= (2\alpha_1 - 1)(1 - \alpha_1) + \max\{0, 1 - 2\alpha_1\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \alpha_1(1 - 2\alpha_1), & \text{if } \alpha_1 \leq 1/2, \\ (2\alpha_1 - 1)(1 - \alpha_1), & \text{if } \alpha_1 > 1/2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ whenever $\alpha_1 \neq 1/2$. This implies that $]x_1, x_3[\cap \text{dom}(T_5) = \{(0, 0)\}$.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_2, x_4\}$, that is $\alpha_3 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_4 = 1$ with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_4 \geq 0$. Therefore $z_0 = (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4, \alpha_2 - \alpha_4)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \\
&= \alpha_2 \max\{\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4 - 1, 3\alpha_4 - 1\} + \alpha_4 \max\{\alpha_2 - 1, \alpha_4 - 1\} \\
&\quad + (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4) \max\{-1 + 2\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_4, \alpha_2 + \alpha_4\} \\
&= \alpha_2(2\alpha_4 - 1 + \max\{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}) + \alpha_4(-1 + \max\{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}) \\
&\quad + (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4)(\alpha_2 + \alpha_4 + \max\{-1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_4, 0\}) \\
&= -\alpha_2^2 - \alpha_4^2 + (\alpha_2 + \alpha_4) \max\{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\},
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) = \begin{cases} \alpha_4(\alpha_2 - \alpha_4), & \text{if } \alpha_2 \geq \alpha_4, \\ \alpha_2(\alpha_4 - \alpha_2), & \text{if } \alpha_2 < \alpha_4. \end{cases}$$

Therefore $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \leq 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_4 > 0$, or $\alpha_4 = \alpha_2$, or $\alpha_4 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 > 0$.

- If $\alpha_2 = 0$ then $z_0 \in [x_4, x_1]$. In this case, the coefficients α_i are unique, so this implies that $z_0 \in \text{dom}(T_5)$.
- If $\alpha_4 = 0$ then $z_0 \in [x_1, x_2]$. In this case, the coefficients α_i are also unique, so this implies that $z_0 \in \text{dom}(T_5)$.
- If $\alpha_2 = \alpha_4$ then z_0 is in the x -axis. We already proved that z_0 cannot be in $\text{dom}(T_5)$ unless $z_0 = (0, 0)$.

In any other case, $z_0 \notin \text{dom}(T_5)$. This in particular implies that the interior of the triangle $\text{co}\{x_1, x_2, x_4\}$ and its vertical side, without the origin, does not intersect the domain of T_5 .

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_2, x_3, x_4\}$, that is $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 1$ with $\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4 \geq 0$. Therefore $z_0 = (\alpha_2 + \alpha_4 - 1, \alpha_2 - \alpha_4)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \\
&= \alpha_2 \max\{2 - 3\alpha_2, 2 - 2\alpha_2 - \alpha_4\} + \alpha_4 \max\{-\alpha_2, -\alpha_4\} \\
&\quad + (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4) \max\{-2\alpha_2, -1 - \alpha_2 + \alpha_4\} \\
&= \alpha_2(2(1 - \alpha_2) + \max\{-\alpha_2, -\alpha_4\}) + \alpha_4 \max\{-\alpha_2, -\alpha_4\} \\
&\quad + (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4)(-2\alpha_2 + \max\{0, -1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_4\}) \\
&= 2\alpha_2\alpha_4 + (\alpha_2 + \alpha_4) \max\{-\alpha_2, -\alpha_4\},
\end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) = \begin{cases} \alpha_4(\alpha_2 - \alpha_4), & \text{if } \alpha_2 \geq \alpha_4, \\ \alpha_2(\alpha_4 - \alpha_2), & \text{if } \alpha_2 < \alpha_4. \end{cases}$$

Again $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) \leq 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_2 = 0$ and $\alpha_4 > 0$, or $\alpha_4 = \alpha_2$, or $\alpha_4 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 > 0$. As before, this implies that the segments $[x_2, x_3]$ and $[x_3, x_4]$ belong to the domain of T_5 and no point in the interior of the triangle $\text{co}\{x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ belongs to the domain of T_5 .

In conclusion,

$$\text{dom}(T_5) = \{(0, 0)\} \cup [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_2, x_3] \cup [x_3, x_4] \cup [x_4, x_1].$$

We now will deduce the formula of T_5 .

- $T_5(0, 0) = (-1, -1/2)$, as we already verified.
- $z_0 \in]x_1, x_2[\iff z_0 = (1-t, t)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (22) through (25), we obtain:

$$(22) \quad \text{implies} \quad 1 \leq v - u,$$

$$(23) \quad \text{implies} \quad -1 \leq u - v,$$

$$(24) \quad \text{implies} \quad -t - 1 \leq (2-t)u + tv,$$

$$(25) \quad \text{implies} \quad t - 1 \leq (1-t)u + (1+t)v.$$

That is $v = 1 + u$, $u \geq -1$, $u \geq -t - 1/2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_5(1-t, t) &= \{(u, v) : v = 1 + u, u \geq \max\{-1, -t - 1/2\}\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{(u, v) : v = 1 + u, u \geq -t - 1/2\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ \{(u, v) : v = 1 + u, u \geq -1\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (-t - 1/2, -t + 1/2) + \text{cone}\{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-1, 0) + \text{cone}\{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- $z_0 \in]x_2, x_3[\iff z_0 = (-t, 1-t)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (22) through (25), we obtain:

$$(22) \quad \text{implies} \quad 1 + 2t \leq -(1+t)u + (1-t)v,$$

$$(23) \quad \text{implies} \quad 2 \leq -u - v,$$

$$(24) \quad \text{implies} \quad -2 \leq u + v,$$

$$(25) \quad \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq -tu + (2-t)v.$$

That is $u + v = -2$, $v \geq -1/2$, $v \geq -t$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_5(-t, 1-t) &= \{(u, v) : u + v = -2, v \geq \max\{-1/2, -t\}\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{(u, v) : u + v = -2, v \geq -t\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ \{(u, v) : u + v = -2, v \geq -1/2\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (t-2, -t) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-3/2, -1/2) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- $z_0 \in]x_3, x_4[\iff z_0 = (t-1, -t)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (22) through (25), we obtain:

$$(22) \quad \text{implies} \quad 3 - 2t \leq (t-2)u - tv,$$

$$(23) \quad \text{implies} \quad 2 \leq (t-1)u - (t+1)v,$$

$$(24) \quad \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq u - v,$$

$$(25) \quad \text{implies} \quad 0 \leq -u + v.$$

That is $u = v$, $v \leq -1$, $v \leq t - 3/2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_5(t-1, -t) &= \{(u, v) : u = v, v \leq \min\{-1, t - 3/2\}\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{(u, v) : u = v, v \leq t - 3/2\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ \{(u, v) : u = v, v \leq -1\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (t-3/2, t-3/2) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-1, -1) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- $z_0 \in]x_4, x_1[\iff z_0 = (t, t-1)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Replacing this in equations (22) through (25), we obtain:

$$(22) \quad \text{implies} \quad 1 \leq -u - v,$$

$$(23) \quad \text{implies} \quad 2 - 3t \leq tu + (t-2)v,$$

$$(24) \quad \text{implies} \quad -t \leq (t+1)u + (t-1)v,$$

$$(25) \quad \text{implies} \quad -1 \leq u + v.$$

That is $u + v = -1$, $v \leq t - 1$, $v \leq -1/2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_5(t, t-1) &= \{(u, v) : u + v = -1, v \leq \min\{-1/2, t-1\}\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{(u, v) : u + v = -1, v \leq t-1\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ \{(u, v) : u + v = -1, v \leq -1/2\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (-t, t-1) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-1/2, -1/2) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we obtain the following correspondence rule:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5(1, 0) &= \text{co}\{(-1/2, -1/2), (-1/2, 1/2)\} + \text{cone co}\{(1, -1), (1, 1)\}, \\
T_5(0, 1) &= \text{co}\{(-1, 0), (-2, 0)\} + \text{cone co}\{(1, 1), (-1, 1)\}, \\
T_5(-1, 0) &= \text{co}\{(-3/2, -1/2), (-3/2, -3/2)\} + \text{cone co}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}, \\
T_5(0, -1) &= \text{co}\{(-1, -1), (0, -1)\} + \text{cone co}\{(-1, -1), (1, -1)\}, \\
T_5(0, 0) &= (-1, -1/2),
\end{aligned}$$

and, for all $t \in]0, 1[$,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5(1-t, t) &= \begin{cases} (-t-1/2, -t+1/2) + \text{cone}\{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-1, 0) + \text{cone}\{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \\
T_5(-t, 1-t) &= \begin{cases} (t-2, -t) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-3/2, -1/2) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \\
T_5(t-1, -t) &= \begin{cases} (t-3/2, t-3/2) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-1, -1) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases} \\
T_5(t, t-1) &= \begin{cases} (-t, t-1) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2 \\ (-1/2, -1/2) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

See Figure 4 for a graphical representation of the domain and range.

Note that the operator T_5 can be written as

$$T_5 = \left[\bigcup_{i=1}^8 \text{co}\{(y_i, y_i^*), (y_{i+1}, y_{i+1}^*)\} + N_C \right] \cup \{(0, 0), (-1, -1/2)\}.$$

From Lemma 2.4, the operator $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^8 \text{co}\{(y_i, y_i^*), (y_{i+1}, y_{i+1}^*)\} + N_C$ is 2-cyclically monotone. Also from Lemma 2.4, $\mathcal{F}^{\mu_p} = S^{\mu_p}$. Since $((0, 0), (-1, -1/2)) \in \mathcal{F}^{\mu_p}$, we conclude that T_5 is also 2-cyclically monotone. Therefore T_5 is maximal 2-cyclically monotone.

Remark 5.1. It is possible to verify that if we use $x_5 = (0, 0)$, $x_5^* = (-1, -1/2)$ as an additional starting point, we would have obtained the same operator.

5.5 Another bizarre maximal 2-cyclically monotone operator

Consider the starting points:

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1 &= (0, 0) & x_1^* &= (-1, -1/2), \\
x_2 &= (1, 0) & x_2^* &= (0, 1), \\
x_3 &= (0, 1) & x_3^* &= (-1, 0), \\
x_4 &= (-1, 0) & x_4^* &= (-2, 2), \\
x_5 &= (0, -1) & x_5^* &= (0, -1).
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 4: Perturbation of Bauschke and Wang example

Using our procedure, we deduce the following images of x_1, \dots, x_5 :

$$\begin{aligned}
T_5(x_1) &= \{-1\} \times [-1, 0], \\
&= \text{co}\{(-1, -1), (-1, 0)\}, \\
T_5(x_2) &= \{(u, v) : u \geq 0, -1 - u \leq v \leq 1 + u\}, \\
&= \text{co}\{(0, -1), (0, 1)\} + \text{cone}\{(1, -1), (1, 1)\}, \\
T_5(x_3) &= \{(u, v) : v \geq 0, -2 - v \leq u \leq v - 1\}, \\
&= \text{co}\{(-1, 0), (-2, 0)\} + \text{cone}\{(1, 1), (-1, 1)\}, \\
T_5(x_4) &= \{(u, v) : u \leq -2, u \leq v \leq -2 - u\}, \\
&= \text{co}\{(-2, 0), (-2, -2)\} + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}, \\
T_5(x_5) &= \{(u, v) : v \leq -1, v \leq u \leq -1 - v\}, \\
&= \text{co}\{(-1, -1), (0, -1)\} + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1), (1, -1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathcal{F} = \{(y_i, y_i^*)\}_{i=1}^{10}$ is given by

$$\begin{array}{llll}
y_1 = (0, 0) & y_1^* = (-1, -1), & y_2 = (0, 0) & y_2^* = (-1, 0), \\
y_3 = (1, 0) & y_3^* = (0, -1), & y_4 = (1, 0) & y_4^* = (0, 1), \\
y_5 = (0, 1) & y_5^* = (-1, 0), & y_6 = (0, 1) & y_6^* = (-2, 0), \\
y_7 = (-1, 0) & y_7^* = (-2, 0), & y_8 = (-1, 0) & y_8^* = (-2, -2), \\
y_9 = (0, -1) & y_9^* = (-1, -1), & y_{10} = (0, -1) & y_{10}^* = (0, -1),
\end{array}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dom}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (-1, 0), (0, -1)\} \\
\text{ran}(\mathcal{F}) &= \{(-1, -1), (-1, 0), (0, -1), (0, 1), (-2, 0), (-2, -2)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now consider $z_0 = (x, y)$ and $z_0^* = (u, v)$, and follow the steps of the proof of Proposition 2.6, so we obtain the set of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} -2x, -x, -2x - 2y - 1, \\ -x - y, y - 1, -y \end{array} \right\} \leq xu + yv \\
& \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 1 - 2x, 1 - x, -x - y, \\ -y, y, -2x - 2y - 2 \end{array} \right\} \leq (x - 1)u + yv \\
& \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} -2x, -x, -y - 1, -x - y, \\ y - 1, -2x - 2y \end{array} \right\} \leq xu + (y - 1)v \quad (26) \\
& \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} -x - 2, -2x - 2, -y - 1, y - 4, \\ -x - y - 1, -2x - 2y - 2 \end{array} \right\} \leq (x + 1)u + yv \\
& \max \left\{ \begin{array}{c} -x - 1, -2x - 2, -y - 1, y - 1, \\ -x - y - 1, -2x - 2y - 2 \end{array} \right\} \leq xu + (y + 1)v.
\end{aligned}$$

Equations (26), along with the domain conditions:

$$x - 1 \leq y \leq x + 1, \quad -x - 1 \leq y \leq 1 - x.$$

allow us to obtain the simplified equations:

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_1) := \max\{-2x, -x, -x - y, -y\} \leq xu + yv, \quad (27)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_2) := \max\{1 - 2x, 1 - x\} \leq (x - 1)u + yv, \quad (28)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_3) := \max\{-2x, -x, -x - y, -2x - 2y\} \leq xu + (y - 1)v, \quad (29)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_4) := \max\{-1 - y, -1 - x - y\} \leq (x + 1)u + yv, \quad (30)$$

$$\widetilde{M}(z_0, x_5) := \max\{-1 - x, -1 - y, -1 - x - y, -1 + y\} \leq xu + (y + 1)v. \quad (31)$$

To determine the domain of T_5 , let $z_0 \in C$ and write

$$z_0 = \sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i x_i = (\alpha_2 - \alpha_4, \alpha_3 - \alpha_5),$$

with $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i = 1$. The determination of $\text{dom}(T_5)$ will be done in several steps.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, that is, $\alpha_4 = \alpha_5 = 0$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 1$,

$\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \geq 0$ and $z_0 = (\alpha_2, \alpha_3)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) &= (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) \max\{-2\alpha_2, -\alpha_2, -\alpha_2 - \alpha_3, -\alpha_3\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_2 \max\{1 - 2\alpha_2, 1 - \alpha_2\} + \alpha_3 \max\{-2\alpha_2, -\alpha_2, -\alpha_2 - \alpha_3, -2\alpha_2 - 2\alpha_3\} \\
&= (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) \max\{-\alpha_2, -\alpha_3\} + \alpha_2(1 - \alpha_2) + \alpha_3(-\alpha_2) \\
&= (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3)(\max\{-\alpha_2, -\alpha_3\} + \alpha_2) \\
&= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_3, \\ (\alpha_2 - \alpha_3)(1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) & \text{if } \alpha_2 > \alpha_3. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_2 > \alpha_3$ and $1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 > 0$. Therefore, all $z_0 = (x, y)$ such that $x > y \geq 0$ and $x + y < 1$ do not belong to $\text{dom}(T_6)$.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_3, x_4\}$, that is, $\alpha_2 = \alpha_5 = 0$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 1$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_4 \geq 0$ and $z_0 = (-\alpha_4, \alpha_3)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) &= (1 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4) \max\{2\alpha_4, \alpha_4, \alpha_4 - \alpha_3, -\alpha_3\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_3 \max\{2\alpha_4, \alpha_4, \alpha_4 - \alpha_3, 2\alpha_4 - 2\alpha_3\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_4 \max\{-1 - \alpha_3, -1 + \alpha_4 - \alpha_3\} \\
&= (1 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4)(2\alpha_4) + \alpha_3(2\alpha_4) + \alpha_4(-1 + \alpha_4 - \alpha_3) \\
&= \alpha_4(1 - \alpha_4 - \alpha_3)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_4 > 0$ and $\alpha_3 + \alpha_4 < 1$.

Therefore, all $z_0 = (x, y)$ such that $x < 0$ and $y < 1 + x$ do not belong to $\text{dom}(T_6)$.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_4, x_5\}$, that is, $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5 = 1$,

$\alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha_5 \geq 0$ and $z_0 = (-\alpha_4, -\alpha_5)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) &= (1 - \alpha_4 - \alpha_5) \max\{2\alpha_4, \alpha_4, \alpha_4 + \alpha_5, \alpha_5\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_4 \max\{-1 + \alpha_5, -1 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_5 \max\{-1 + \alpha_4, -1 + \alpha_5, -1 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5, -1 - \alpha_5\} \\
&= (1 - \alpha_4 - \alpha_5)(\alpha_4 + \max\{\alpha_4, \alpha_5\}) + \alpha_4(-1 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5) \\
&\quad + \alpha_5(-1 + \alpha_4 + \alpha_5) \\
&= (1 - \alpha_4 - \alpha_5)(\max\{\alpha_4, \alpha_5\} - \alpha_5) \\
&= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_5, \\ (\alpha_4 - \alpha_5)(1 - \alpha_4 - \alpha_5) & \text{if } \alpha_4 > \alpha_5. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_4 > \alpha_5$ and $1 - \alpha_4 - \alpha_5 > 0$. Therefore, all $z_0 = (x, y)$ such that $x < y \leq 0$ and $x + y > -1$ do not belong to $\text{dom}(T_6)$.

- Let $z_0 \in \text{co}\{x_1, x_2, x_5\}$, that is, $\alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = 0$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_5 = 1$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_5 \geq 0$ and $z_0 = (\alpha_2, -\alpha_5)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) &= (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_5) \max\{-2\alpha_2, -\alpha_2, -\alpha_2 + \alpha_5, \alpha_5\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_2 \max\{1 - 2\alpha_2, 1 - \alpha_2\} \\
&\quad + \alpha_5 \max\{-1 - \alpha_2, -1 + \alpha_5, -1 - \alpha_2 + \alpha_5, -1 - \alpha_5\} \\
&= (1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_5)\alpha_5 + \alpha_2(1 - \alpha_2) + \alpha_5(-1 + \alpha_5) \\
&= \alpha_2(1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_5)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_{i=1}^5 \alpha_i \widetilde{M}(z_0, x_i) > 0$ if, and only if, $\alpha_2 > 0$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_5 < 1$.

Therefore, all $z_0 = (x, y)$ such that $x > 0$ and $y > x - 1$ do not belong to $\text{dom}(T_6)$.

Up to now, we have proved that $\text{dom}(T_6)$ is contained in

$$\bigcup_{i=2}^5 [x_i, x_{i+1}] \cup \{(x, y) : |x| \leq |y| \leq 1 - |x|, xy \geq 0\}.$$

considering $x_6 = x_2$. Next, we will prove that this set is exactly $\text{dom}(T_6)$ and also find the correspondence rule for T_6 .

- Let $z_0 \in]x_3, x_5[\setminus \{x_1\} \iff z_0 = (0, 1 - 2t), t \in]0, 1[, t \neq 1/2$. Thus

$$(27) \text{ implies } \max\{0, 2t - 1\} \leq (1 - 2t)v,$$

$$(28) \text{ implies } 1 \leq -u + (1 - 2t)v,$$

$$(29) \text{ implies } \max\{0, 4t - 2\} \leq -2tv,$$

$$(30) \text{ implies } 2t - 2 \leq u + (1 - 2t)v,$$

$$(31) \text{ implies } \max\{2t - 2, -2t\} \leq 2(1 - t)v.$$

If $t < 1/2$, these equations turn into $v = 0, 2t - 2 \leq u \leq -1$ so

$$T_6(0, 1 - 2t) = [2t - 2, -1] \times \{0\}.$$

Now, if $t > 1/2$, we obtain $v = -1, -1 \leq u \leq 2t - 2$, so

$$T_6(0, 1 - 2t) = [-1, 2t - 2] \times \{-1\}.$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_2, x_3[\iff z_0 = (1 - t, t), t \in]0, 1[$. Thus

$$(27) \text{ implies } \max\{t - 1, -t\} \leq (1 - t)u + tv,$$

$$(28) \text{ implies } 1 \leq v - u,$$

$$(29) \text{ implies } -1 \leq u - v,$$

$$(30) \text{ implies } -1 - t \leq (2 - t)u + tv,$$

$$(31) \text{ implies } t - 1 \leq (1 - t)u + (t + 1)v.$$

Hence $v = 1 + u, u \geq \max\{-2t, -1\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_6(1 - t, t) &= \begin{cases} \{(u, v) : v = 1 + u, u \geq -2t\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2, \\ \{(u, v) : v = 1 + u, u \geq -1\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (-2t, 1 - 2t) + \text{cone}\{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2, \\ (-1, 0) + \text{cone}\{(1, 1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_3, x_4[\iff z_0 = (-t, 1 - t), t \in]0, 1[$. Thus

$$(27) \text{ implies } 2t \leq -tu + (1 - t)v,$$

$$(28) \text{ implies } 1 + 2t \leq -(t + 1)u + (1 - t)v,$$

$$(29) \text{ implies } 2 \leq -u - v,$$

$$(30) \text{ implies } -2 \leq u + v,$$

$$(31) \text{ implies } \max\{-1 + t, -t\} \leq -tu + (2 - t)v.$$

Hence $u + v = -2, u \leq -2$. Therefore

$$T_6(-t, 1 - t) = \{(u, v) : u + v = -2, u \leq -2\} = (-2, 0) + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1)\}.$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_4, x_5[\iff z_0 = (t - 1, -t)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Thus

$$(27) \text{ implies } \max\{2 - 2t, 1\} \leq (t - 1)u - tv,$$

$$(28) \text{ implies } 3 - 2t \leq (t - 2)u - tv,$$

$$(29) \text{ implies } 2 \leq (t - 1)u - (t + 1)v,$$

$$(30) \text{ implies } 0 \leq u - v,$$

$$(31) \text{ implies } 0 \leq -u + v.$$

$$u \leq \min\{2t - 2, -1\}$$

Hence $v = u$, $u \leq \min\{2t - 2, -1\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_6(t - 1, -t) &= \begin{cases} \{(u, v) : v = u, u \leq 2t - 2\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2, \\ \{(u, v) : v = u, u \leq -1\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (2t - 2, 2t - 2) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t \leq 1/2, \\ (-1, -1) + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1)\}, & \text{if } t > 1/2, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- Let $z_0 \in]x_5, x_2[\iff z_0 = (t, t - 1)$, $t \in]0, 1[$. Thus

$$(27) \text{ implies } 1 - t \leq tu + (t - 1)v,$$

$$(28) \text{ implies } 1 \leq -u - v,$$

$$(29) \text{ implies } \max\{-2t + 1, -4t + 2\} \leq tu + (t - 2)v,$$

$$(30) \text{ implies } -t \leq (t + 1)u + (t - 1)v,$$

$$(31) \text{ implies } -1 \leq u + v.$$

Hence $u + v = -1$, $v \leq -1$. Therefore

$$T_6(t, t - 1) = \{(u, v) : u + v = -1, v \leq -1\} = (0, -1) + \text{cone}\{(1, -1)\}.$$

- Let $z = (x, y)$ with $0 < x \leq y < 1 - x$. Then

$$(27) \text{ implies } -x \leq xu + yv, \tag{32}$$

$$(28) \text{ implies } 1 - x \leq (x - 1)u + yv, \tag{33}$$

$$(29) \text{ implies } -x \leq xu + (y - 1)v, \tag{34}$$

$$(30) \text{ implies } -1 - y \leq (x + 1)u + yv, \tag{35}$$

$$(31) \text{ implies } -1 + y \leq xu + (y + 1)v. \tag{36}$$

Combining (32) and (34), we obtain

$$-\frac{x}{y}(u + 1) \leq v \leq \frac{x}{1 - y}(u + 1),$$

so $0 \leq \frac{x(u+1)}{(1-y)y}$, which implies $u \geq -1$. On the other hand, combining (33) and (34), we obtain

$$\frac{1-x}{y}(u+1) \leq v \leq \frac{x}{1-y}(u+1),$$

so $0 \leq \frac{(x+y-1)x(u+1)}{(1-y)y}$, which implies $u \leq -1$. Therefore $u = -1$ and, after replacing in any of the previous inequalities, $v = 0$. It is straightforward to verify that $(-1, 0)$ also satisfies (35) and (36). Thus, for $0 < x \leq y < 1-x$,

$$T_6(x, y) = (-1, 0).$$

- Let $z = (x, y)$ with $-1-x < y \leq x < 0$. Then

$$(27) \quad \text{implies} \quad -x-y \leq xu+yv, \quad (37)$$

$$(28) \quad \text{implies} \quad 1-2x \leq (x-1)u+yv, \quad (38)$$

$$(29) \quad \text{implies} \quad -2x-2y \leq xu+(y-1)v, \quad (39)$$

$$(30) \quad \text{implies} \quad -1-x-y \leq (x+1)u+yv, \quad (40)$$

$$(31) \quad \text{implies} \quad -1-x-y \leq xu+(y+1)v. \quad (41)$$

Combining (37) and (41), we obtain

$$-\frac{x}{y+1}(u+1) \leq v+1 \leq -\frac{x}{y}(u+1)$$

so $\frac{x(u+1)}{y(y+1)} \leq 0$, which implies $u \leq -1$. On the other hand, combining (40) and (41), we obtain

$$-\frac{x}{y+1}(u+1) \leq v+1 \leq -\frac{x+1}{y}(u+1)$$

so $\frac{(x+y+1)(u+1)}{y(y+1)} \leq 0$, which implies $u \geq -1$. Therefore $u = -1$ and, after replacing in any of the previous inequalities, $v = -1$. It is also straightforward to verify that $(-1, -1)$ also satisfies (33) and (34). Thus, for $-1-x < y \leq x < 0$,

$$T_6(x, y) = (-1, -1).$$

Therefore, the full correspondence rule of T_6 is

$$\begin{aligned} T_6(0, 0) &= \text{co}\{(-1, -1), (-1, 0)\}, \\ T_6(1, 0) &= \text{co}\{(0, -1), (0, 1)\} + \text{cone}\{(1, -1), (1, 1)\}, \\ T_6(0, 1) &= \text{co}\{(-1, 0), (-2, 0)\} + \text{cone}\{(1, 1), (-1, 1)\}, \\ T_6(-1, 0) &= \text{co}\{(-2, 0), (-2, -2)\} + \text{cone}\{(-1, 1), (-1, -1)\}, \\ T_6(0, -1) &= \text{co}\{(-1, -1), (0, -1)\} + \text{cone}\{(-1, -1), (1, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 5: Yet another maximal 2-cyclically monotone operator

and, for all $t \in]0, 1[$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_6(1-t, t) &= \begin{cases} (-2t, 1-2t), & \text{if } t \in]0, 1/2[, \\ (-1, 0), & \text{if } t \in [1/2, 1[, \end{cases} \\
 T_6(-t, 1-t) &= (-2, 0), \\
 T_6(-1+t, -t) &= \begin{cases} (2t-2, 2t-2), & \text{if } t \in]0, 1/2[, \\ (-1, -1), & \text{if } t \in [1/2, 1[, \end{cases} \\
 T_6(t, t-1) &= (0, -1).
 \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for $\alpha \in]-1, 1[\setminus \{0\}$,

$$T_6(0, \alpha) = \begin{cases} [-\alpha-1, -1] \times \{0\} & \text{if } \alpha \in]0, 1[, \\ [-1, -\alpha-1] \times \{-1\} & \text{if } \alpha \in]-1, 0[, \end{cases}$$

and

$$T_6(x, y) = \begin{cases} (-1, 0), & \text{if } 0 < x \leq y < 1-x, \\ (-1, -1), & \text{if } -1-x < y \leq x < 0. \end{cases}$$

See Figure 5 for a partial graph of the domain and range of T_6 .

5.5.1 Proof of maximal 2-cyclical monotonicity

To prove the maximality of T_6 , consider $T_6 = \bigcup_{i=1, \dots, 6} G_i$, where $G_i = T_6|_{D_i}$,

$i = 1, \dots, 6$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_1 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| + |y| = 1\}, & D_2 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < x \leq y < 1-x\}, \\
 D_3 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -1-x < y \leq x < 0\}, & D_4 &= \{(0, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < \alpha < 1\} \\
 D_5 &= \{(0, 0)\}, & D_6 &= \{(0, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -1 < \alpha < 0\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $A = (a, a^*)$, $B = (b, b^*)$, $C = (c, c^*)$ in T_6 , we need to prove that

$$S = \langle b - a, a^* \rangle + \langle c - b, b^* \rangle + \langle a - c, c^* \rangle \leq 0. \quad (42)$$

As $T_6 = \bigcup_{i=1}^6 G_i$ then $A \in G_i$, $B \in G_j$, $C \in G_k$, where (i, j, k) must belong to the set $\{1, \dots, 6\}^3$ which has 216 elements.

To prove the vast majority of the 216 cases, we are going to use the command `Simplify` [12] of the symbolic calculus software *Mathematica*. We used *Mathematica* 8.0.4 for Linux. First consider the following definitions

```
G2[p_, q_, r_, s_] :=
  (0 < p <= q < 1 - p) && (r == -1) && (s == 0)
  && (q > 0) && (p - q <= 0)

G3[p_, q_, r_, s_] :=
  (-1 - p < q <= p < 0) && (r == -1) && (s == -1)
  && (q < 0)

G4[p_, q_, r_, s_] :=
  (p == 0) && (0 < q < 1) && (-q - 1 <= r <= -1)
  && (s == 0) && (r > -2)

G5[p_, q_, r_, s_] :=
  (p == 0) && (q == 0) && (r == -1) && (-1 <= s <= 0)

G6[p_, q_, r_, s_] :=
  (p == 0) && (-1 < q < 0) && (-1 <= r <= -1 - q)
  && (s == -1) && (r < 0)
```

Note that $((p, q), (r, s)) \in G_l$, for $l \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$, if, and only if, the respective evaluation of the boolean functions `G1[p, q, r, s]` is **True**.

The case $(i, j, k) = (1, 1, 1)$: This case is equivalent to prove that G_1 is 2-cyclically monotone. In view of the definition of T_6 , G_1 can be expressed as

$$G_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{10} [(w_i, w_i^*), (w_{i+1}, w_{i+1}^*)] + N_{D_1},$$

where $(w_{11}, w_{11}^*) = (w_1, w_1^*)$ and

$$\begin{array}{llll} w_1 = (1, 0), & w_1^* = (0, -1), & w_2 = (1, 0), & w_2^* = (0, 1), \\ w_3 = (1/2, 1/2), & w_3^* = (-1, 0), & w_4 = (0, 1), & w_4^* = (-1, 0), \\ w_5 = (0, 1), & w_5^* = (-2, 0), & w_6 = (-1, 0), & w_6^* = (-2, 0), \\ w_7 = (-1, 0), & w_7^* = (-2, -2), & w_8 = (-1/2, -1/2), & w_8^* = (-1, -1), \\ w_9 = (0, -1), & w_9^* = (-1, -1), & w_{10} = (0, -1), & w_{10}^* = (0, -1). \end{array}$$

Using the procedure `ispmono` given in Section 4.1, we verify that $\mathcal{W} = \{(w_i, w_i^*)\}_{i=1}^{10}$ is 2-cyclically monotone. It is straightforward to verify that

$$\langle w_i - w_{i+1}, w_i^* - w_{i+1}^* \rangle = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, 10.$$

Thus, using Lemma 2.4, we conclude that G_1 is also 2-cyclically monotone and $G_1^{\mu_2} = \mathcal{W}^{\mu_2}$.

This proves 1 case of 216.

The case $(i, j, k) = (1, 1, k)$, $k \neq 1$: By cyclicity of S , this case is equivalent to the cases $(1, j, 1)$ and $(i, 1, 1)$, $i, j \neq 1$, totalling 15 cases.

Note that, $S \leq 0$, for all $A, B \in G_1$, $C \in G_k$ is equivalent to $G_k \subset G_1^{\mu_2}$. Since $G_1^{\mu_2} = \mathcal{W}^{\mu_2}$, we use the procedure `polareqs` given in Section 4.3 applied to the finite operator $\mathcal{W} = \{(w_i, w_i^*)\}_{i=1}^{10}$. So any $\bar{x} = (x, y)$, $\bar{x}^* = (u, v)$ such that $(\bar{x}, \bar{x}^*) \in \mathcal{W}^{\mu_2}$ must satisfy the equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -(x+2), -2(x+1), -(y+1) \\ -(x+y+1), y-4, -2(x+y+1) \end{array} \right\} &\leq u(x+1) + vy, \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -2(x+1), -(2x+3)/2, -y-1, \\ -y-x-1, y-2, -2(y+x+1) \end{array} \right\} &\leq u(x+1/2) + v(y+1/2), \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -x-1, -2(x+1), -y-1, \\ -y-x-1, y-1, -2(y+x+1) \end{array} \right\} &\leq ux + v(y+1), \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -2x, -x, -y-1, -y-x, \\ y-1, -2(y+x) \end{array} \right\} &\leq ux + v(y-1), \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -(2x-1)/2, -(4x-1)/2, -y-x, \\ (2y-1)/2, -(2y+1)/2, -(4y+4x+1)/2 \end{array} \right\} &\leq u(x-1/2) + v(y-1/2), \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1-2x, 1-x, -y-x, \\ -y, y, -2(y+x+1) \end{array} \right\} &\leq u(x-1) + vy, \end{aligned}$$

These equations can be implemented in *Mathematica*, as boolean functions in terms of (x, y, u, v) .

```
pol1[x_, y_, u_, v_] :=
  Max[-(x + 2), -2 (x + 1), -(y + 1), -(x + y + 1),
    y - 4, -2 (x + y + 1)] <= u (x + 1) + v y

pol2[x_, y_, u_, v_] :=
  Max[-2 (x + 1), -(2 x + 3)/2, -y - 1, -y - x - 1,
    y - 2, -2 (y + x + 1)] <= u (x + 1/2) + v (y + 1/2)

pol3[x_, y_, u_, v_] :=
  Max[-x - 1, -2 (x + 1), -y - 1, -y - x - 1,
    y - 1, -2 (y + x + 1)] <= u x + v (y + 1)

pol4[x_, y_, u_, v_] :=
```

```

Max[-2 x, -x, -y - 1, -y - x, y - 1, -2 (y + x)]
  <= u x + v (y - 1)

pol5[x_, y_, u_, v_] :=
  Max[-(2 x - 1)/2, -(4 x - 1)/2, -y - x, (2 y - 1)/2,
    -(2 y + 1)/2, -(4 y + 4 x + 1)/2]
  <= u (x - 1/2) + v (y - 1/2)

pol6[x_, y_, u_, v_] :=
  Max[1 - 2 x, 1 - x, -y - x, -y, y, -2 (y + x + 1)]
  <= u (x - 1) + v y

```

The instruction

```

Table[
  Simplify[eq[x, y, u, v], g[x, y, u, v]],
  {eq, {pol1, pol2, pol3, pol4, pol5, pol6}},
  {g, {G2, G3, G4, G5, G6}}]

```

allow us to obtain a 6×5 array full of **True** symbols. This implies that for $i \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$, every element in G_i satisfies the defining equations of $G_1^{\mu_2}$. Thus $G_i \subset G_1^{\mu_2}$.

The case $(i, j, k) = (1, j, k)$, $j, k \neq 1$: By cyclicity of S , this case is equivalent to the cases $(i, 1, k)$ and $(i, j, 1)$. Each one comprehends 25 cases, totalling 75 cases.

For fixed (b, b^*) , (c, c^*) , consider the supremum

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{S} &= \sup_{(a, a^*) \in G_1} \langle b - a, a^* \rangle + \langle a, c^* \rangle \\
 &= \sup \left\{ \langle b - a_l(t), a_l^*(t) \rangle + \langle a_l(t), c^* \rangle : \begin{array}{l} l = 1, \dots, 10, \\ t \in [0, 1] \end{array} \right\},
 \end{aligned}$$

where $(a_l(t), a_l^*(t)) = (1 - t)(w_l, w_l^*) + t(w_{l+1}, w_{l+1}^*)$, for all $l = 1, \dots, 10$. As G_1 is compact, the previous supremum is attained, so there exist $\tilde{l} \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$, $s \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\hat{S} = \langle b - a_{\tilde{l}}(s), a_{\tilde{l}}^*(s) \rangle + \langle a_{\tilde{l}}(s), c^* \rangle.$$

Since $t \mapsto \langle b - a_{\tilde{l}}(t), a_{\tilde{l}}^*(t) \rangle + \langle a_{\tilde{l}}(t), c^* \rangle$ is affine, the supremum must be attained when $s = 0$ or $s = 1$. This means

$$\hat{S} = \langle b - w_k, w_k^* \rangle + \langle w_k, c^* \rangle$$

where $k = \tilde{l}$ or $k = \tilde{l} + 1$. Therefore

$$\hat{S} = \max_{l=1, \dots, 10} \langle b - w_l, w_l^* \rangle + \langle w_l, c^* \rangle$$

and thus

$$\langle b - a, a^* \rangle + \langle c - b, b^* \rangle + \langle a - c, c^* \rangle \leq 0, \quad \forall (a, a^*) \in G_1, (b, b^*) \in G_j, (c, c^*) \in G_k$$

if and only if

$$\langle b - w_i, w_i^* \rangle + \langle c - b, b^* \rangle + \langle w_i - c, c^* \rangle \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, 10\}, \quad \forall (b, b^*) \in G_j, (c, c^*) \in G_k$$

if and only if

$$f(b, c^*) + \langle c - b, b^* \rangle - \langle c, c^* \rangle \leq 0, \quad \forall (b, b^*) \in G_j, (c, c^*) \in G_k,$$

where $f(b, c^*) = \max_{i=1, \dots, 10} \langle b - w_i, w_i^* \rangle + \langle w_i, c^* \rangle$. Function f can be implemented in *Maxima* with the following code:

```
f(opW, b, cs) := block([ww, maxval],
  maxval: -inf,
  for ww in opW do(
    maxval: max(maxval, (b - xc(ww)) . xsc(ww) + xc(ww) . cs)
  ),
  maxval
) $
```

Now consider $b = (x, y)$ and $c^* = (u, v)$. Using the above procedure we obtain

$$f(b, c^*) = \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} v - 2x, -x + (v + u + 1)/2, v - x, u - y, \\ -2(x + 1) - u, -2(y + x + 1) - u, -y - v - 1, \\ -y - x - v - 1, -y - x - (v + u)/2 - 1, y + u \end{array} \right\} \quad (43)$$

To verify the 25 cases of the form $(1, j, k)$, $j, k \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$, consider the following definition in *Mathematica* of the function f as in (43),

```
fn[x_, y_, u_, v_] :=
  Max[ v - 2 x, -x + (v + u + 1)/2, v - x, -2 (x + 1) - u,
    -2 (y + x + 1) - u, u - y, -y - v - 1, -y - x - v - 1,
    -y - x - (v + u)/2 - 1, y + u ]
```

We next define

```
hatS = fn[bx, by, csx, csy]
  + (bsx (cx - bx) + bsy (cy - by)) - (cx csx + cy csy)
```

where $b = (bx, by)$, $b^* = (bsx, bsy)$, $c = (cx, cy)$, $c^* = (csx, csy)$. In order to verify $S \leq 0$, whenever $(a, a^*) \in G_1$ and $(b, b^*) \in G_j$, $(c, c^*) \in G_k$, for $j, k \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$, we consider the following instruction

```
Table[
  Simplify[hatS <= 0,
    g[bx, by, bsx, bsy] && h[cx, cy, csx, csy]],
  {g, {G2, G3, G4, G5, G6}}, {h, {G2, G3, G4, G5, G6}}
]
```

This instruction asks to simplify the claim $S \leq 0$ subject to both the conditions $g[bx, by, bsx, bsy]$ and $h[cx, cy, csx, csy]$ being true. After running the previous instruction, *Mathematica* outputs a list of 25 “**True**” symbols.

The case $(i, j, k), i, j, k \neq 1$: We now address the remaining 125 cases. In a similar way as before, we define

$$S = (\{bx, by\} - \{ax, ay\}) \cdot \{asx, asy\} \\ + (\{cx, cy\} - \{bx, by\}) \cdot \{bsx, bsy\} \\ + (\{ax, ay\} - \{cx, cy\}) \cdot \{csx, csy\}$$

as in (42), where $a = (ax, ay)$, $a^* = (asx, asy)$, $b = (bx, by)$, $b^* = (bsx, bsy)$, $c = (cx, cy)$, $c^* = (csx, csy)$.

```
Table[{f, g, h,
  Simplify[S <= 0,
    f[ax, ay, asx, asy]
    && g[bx, by, bsx, bsy] && h[cx, cy, csx, csy]]},
  {f, {G2, G3, G4, G5, G6}},
  {g, {G2, G3, G4, G5, G6}}, {h, {G2, G3, G4, G5, G6}}]
```

This instruction creates a 125×4 table with the simplification of the term $S \leq 0$, alongside the case considered. For instance, the row $\{G2, G3, G6, \mathbf{True}\}$ means that $S \leq 0$ simplifies to **True**, whenever $(a, a^*) \in G_2$, $(b, b^*) \in G_3$ and $(c, c^*) \in G_6$. In this case, however, the array produced contains mostly **True** symbols in its fourth column, with the exception of the following rows:

```
{G2, G5, G6, ax + ax csx + cy + bsy cy <= ay}
{G5, G6, G2, by + asy by + cx + bsx cx <= cy}
{G6, G2, G5, ay + bx + asx bx + ay csy <= by}
{G3, G5, G4, ax + ay + ax csx + bsy cy <= 0}
{G4, G3, G5, bx + asx bx + by + ay csy <= 0}
{G5, G4, G3, asy by + cx + bsx cx + cy <= 0}
```

These rows correspond to the cases $(i, j, k) = (2, 5, 6)$ (or, equivalently, $(5, 6, 2)$ or $(6, 2, 5)$) and $(i, j, k) = (3, 5, 4)$ (equivalently, $(5, 4, 3)$ or $(4, 3, 5)$). We now deal with these two final cases separately:

- When $(i, j, k) = (2, 5, 6)$, it means that $a = (ax, ay)$, $a^* = (asx, asy)$, $b = (bx, by)$, $b^* = (bsx, bsy)$, $c = (cx, cy)$ and $c^* = (csx, csy)$, satisfy

$$0 < ax \leq ay < 1 - ax, \quad asx = -1, \quad asy = 0, \\ bx = 0, \quad by = 0, \quad bsx = -1, \quad -1 \leq bsy \leq 0, \\ cx = 0, \quad -1 < cy < 0, \quad -1 \leq csx \leq -1 - cy, \quad csy = -1$$

Replacing the above equalities on equation (42), we obtain

$$S = (ax - ay) + (ax \cdot csx) + (1 + bsy)cy.$$

It trivially follows that $S \leq 0$, since $ax - ay \leq 0$, $ax > 0$, $csx < 0$, $1 + bsy \geq 0$ and $cy < 0$.

- When $(i, j, k) = (3, 5, 4)$, it means that $a = (ax, ay)$, $a^* = (asx, asy)$, $b = (bx, by)$, $b^* = (bsx, bsy)$, $c = (cx, cy)$ and $c^* = (csx, csy)$, satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} -1 - ax < ay \leq ax < 0, \quad asx = -1, \quad asy = -1, \\ bx = 0, \quad by = 0, \quad bsx = -1, \quad -1 \leq bsy \leq 0, \\ cx = 0, \quad 0 < cy < 1, \quad -1 - cy \leq csx \leq -1, \quad csy = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Replacing the above equalities on equation (42), we obtain

$$S = ax + ay + ax \cdot csx + bsy \cdot cy \leq 2ax + ax \cdot csx + bsy \cdot cy,$$

since $ay \leq ax$. It follows that $S \leq 0$, since $ax < 0$, $csx > -2$, $bsy \leq 0$ and $cy > 0$.

We now are able to conclude that T_6 is 2-cyclically monotone, and therefore, maximal 2-cyclically monotone.

References

- [1] E. Asplund. A monotone convergence theorem for sequences of nonlinear mappings. In *Nonlinear Functional Analysis (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XVIII, Part 1, Chicago, Ill., 1968)*, pages 1–9. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1970.
- [2] S. Bartz, H. H. Bauschke, J. M. Borwein, S. Reich, and X. Wang. Fitzpatrick functions, cyclic monotonicity and Rockafellar’s antiderivative. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 66(5):1198–1223, 2007.
- [3] H. H. Bauschke and X. Wang. An explicit example of a maximal 3-cyclically monotone operator with bizarre properties. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 69(9):2875–2891, 2008.
- [4] O. Bueno and J. Cotrina. Remarks on p-cyclically monotone operators. *Optimization*, 0(0):1–17, 2019.
- [5] J.-P. Crouzeix and C. Gutan. A measure of asymmetry for positive semidefinite matrices. *Optimization*, 52(3):251–262, 2003.
- [6] J.-P. Crouzeix, E. Ocaña, and W. Sosa. A construction of a maximal monotone extension of a monotone map. In *RFMAO 05—Rencontres Franco-Marocaines en Approximation et Optimisation 2005*, volume 20 of *ESAIM Proc.*, pages 93–104. EDP Sci., Les Ulis, 2007.
- [7] A. Domarkas. gt - package for solving game theory problems. <https://klevas.mif.vu.lt/~aleksas/maxima/gt.mac>. Accessed: 2020-02-24.

- [8] J. E. Martínez-Legaz and B. F. Svaiter. Monotone operators representable by l.s.c. convex functions. *Set-Valued Anal.*, 13(1):21–46, 2005.
- [9] R. T. Rockafellar. Characterization of the subdifferentials of convex functions. *Pacific J. Math.*, 17:497–510, 1966.
- [10] P. Slomski. [Maxima] function like Mathematica’s Tuples. <https://def.fe.up.pt/pipermail/maxima-discuss/2010/033345.html>. Accessed: 2020-02-24.
- [11] X. Wang and L. Yao. Maximally monotone linear subspace extensions of monotone subspaces: explicit constructions and characterizations. *Math. Program.*, 139(1-2, Ser. B):327–352, 2013.
- [12] Wolfram Research, Inc. Wolfram language & system documentation center. <https://reference.wolfram.com/language/ref/Simplify>. Accessed: 2020-02-24