## WEAK FORMULATION OF THE MTW CONDITION AND CONVEXITY PROPERTIES OF POTENTIALS

GRÉGOIRE LOEPER<sup>1</sup>, NEIL S TRUDINGER<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Monash University, School of Mathematical Sciences <sup>2</sup> The Australian National University, Mathematical Sciences Institute

ABSTRACT. We simplify the geometric interpretation of the weak Ma-Trudinger-Wang condition for regularity in optimal transportation and provide a largely geometric proof of the global c-convexity of locally c-convex potentials when the cost function c is only assumed twice differentiable.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We consider a cost function c defined on the product  $\Omega \times \Omega^*$  of two domains  $\Omega, \Omega^*$  in Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For a mapping  $\phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$  we define its c-transform  $\phi^c : \Omega^* \to \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\forall y \in \Omega^*, \phi^c(y) = \sup_{x \in \Omega} \{-\phi(x) - c(x, y)\}.$$

Conversely we define the  $c^*$ - transform of  $\psi : \Omega^* \to \mathbb{R}$ . A c-convex potential has at every point  $x \in \Omega$  a c-support, i.e., there exists  $y \in \Omega^*, \psi = \psi(y) \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\forall x' \in \Omega, \phi(x') \ge -\psi(y) - c(x', y),$$

with equality at x' = x. It follows from this definition that

$$\phi(x) = \sup_{y \in \Omega^*} \{ -\psi(y) - c(x, y) \}$$

and that  $\phi$  can be obtained as the  $c^*$  transform of  $\psi : \Omega^* \to \mathbb{R}$ . It then turns out that  $\psi = \phi^c$ . For  $\phi$  a c-convex potential, and  $\phi^c$  its c-transform, we define as in [2] the contact set as a set valued map  $G_{\phi}$ given by

$$G_{\phi}(y) = \{x : \phi(x) + \phi^{c}(y) = -c(x, y)\}.$$

for  $y \in \Omega^*$ . We will also use the notions of c-segment, c-convexity of domains. Whenever needed, we will refer to the conditions A1, A2, A3, A3w that have been introduced in [5, 8]. One of the main features of this paper is that we will assume throughout that the cost function

*E-mail address*: gregoire.loeper@monash.edu, neil.trudinger@anu.edu.au. *Date*: March 18, 2022.

c is globally  $C^2(\Omega \times \Omega^*)$ , without any further explicit smoothness hypotheses. As usual we will use subscripts to denote partial derivatives of c with respect to variables  $x \in \Omega$  and subscripts preceded by a comma to denote partial derivatives with respect to  $y \in \Omega^*$ , so that in particular  $c_x, c_i, c_{,y}, c_{,j}, c_{i,j}$  denote the partial derivatives of c with respect to  $x, x_i, y, y_j, x_i y_j$ . We also use  $c^{x,y} = [c^{i,j}]$  to denote the inverse of the matrix  $c_{x,y} = [c_{i,j}]$ . We further assume throughout the paper that c satisfies the assumptions A1, A2 of [5], that is for all  $x \in \Omega$  the mapping  $y \to -c_x(x, y)$  is injective, that the dual counterpart holds and the matrix  $c_{x,y}$  is not singular. We also introduce what will be a weak form of assumption A3w:

**Definition 1.1.** The cost function satisfies A3v if: for all  $x, x_1 \in \Omega$ and  $y_0, y_1 \in \Omega^*$ , for all  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , with

$$c_x(x, y_\theta) = \theta c_x(x, y_1) + (1 - \theta) c_x(x, y_0),$$

there holds

$$\max\{-c(x, y_0) + c(x_0, y_0), -c(x, y_1) + c(x_0, y_1)\} \\ \geq -c(x, y_\theta) + c(x_0, y_\theta) + o(|x - x_0|^2),$$

where the term  $o(|x - x_0|^2)$  may depend on  $\theta$ .

From [2] it is known that when the cost function is  $C^4$ , **A3v** is equivalent to **A3w**.

Our main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.2.** Let  $c : \Omega \times \Omega^* \to \mathbb{R}$  be a  $C^2$  cost-function satisfying A1, A2 with  $\Omega, \Omega^*$  c-convex with respect to each other. Assume that

(i) c satisfies A3v.

Then

- (ii) for all  $y_0, y_1 \in \Omega^*$ ,  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ , the set  $U = \{x \in \Omega : c(x, y_0) c(x, y_1) \le \sigma\}$  is c-convex with respect to  $y_0$ ,
- (iii) for all  $\phi$  c-convex,  $x \in \Omega$ ,  $y \in \Omega^*$ , the contact set  $G_{\phi}(y)$  and its dual  $G_{\phi^c}(x)$  are connected,
- (iv) any locally c-convex function in  $\Omega$  is globally c-convex.

REMARK. The novelty of the result lies in the way it is obtained; at no point do we have to differentiate the cost function c. Hence the computations from previous proofs [1, 4, 7], in the case when  $c \in C^4$ , do not have to be reproduced. The proof will be based on a purely geometric interpretation of condition **A3v**.

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In what follows we will use the term c-exponential (c-exp), as in [2], to denote the mapping in condition A1, that is

$$y = \operatorname{c-exp}_x(p) \Leftrightarrow -c_x(x,y) = p.$$

We recall also that

$$D_p(c-\exp_x) = -c^{x,y}$$

The core of the proof lies in the following two lemmas,

**Lemma 2.1** (c-hyperplane lemma). Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$ ,  $y_0, y_1 \in \Omega^*$  and let  $y_{\theta} = c \cdot exp_{x_0}p_{\theta}$  where  $p_{\theta} = (1 - \theta)c_x(x_0, y_0) + \theta c_x(x_0, y_1)$ ,  $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ , denote a point on the c-segment from  $y_0$  to  $y_1$ , with respect to  $x_0$ . Consider, for  $\theta > 0$ , the section,

$$S_{\theta} = S(x_0, y_0, y_{\theta}) := \{ x \in \Omega : c(x, y_0) - c(x_0, y_0) \le c(x, y_{\theta}) - c(x_0, y_{\theta}) \}.$$

Then as  $\theta$  approaches  $0, \partial S_{\theta} \cap \Omega$  converges to  $H_0$ , the c<sup>\*</sup>-hyperplane with respect to  $y_0$ , passing through  $x_0$ , with c-normal vector  $p_1 - p_0$ , given by

$$H_0 = H_0(x_0, y_0, y_1) = \{ x \in \Omega : -c^{x, y}(x_0, y_0)(p_1 - p_0) \cdot [c_{, y}(x, y_0) - c_{, y}(x_0, y_0)] = 0 \}$$

**PROOF.** Locally around  $\theta = 0$ , the equation of  $\partial S_{\theta}$  reads

$$[c_{,y}(x,y_0) - c_{,y}(x_0,y_0)] \cdot (y_\theta - y_0) = o(\theta).$$

Passing to the limit as  $\theta$  goes to 0, we obtain

$$[c_{,y}(x,y_0) - c_{,y}(x_0,y_0)] \cdot \partial_\theta y_\theta = 0,$$

which gives the desired result, since

$$\partial_{\theta} y_{\theta} = -c^{x,y}(x_0, y_0)(p_1 - p_0)$$

REMARK. We call  $H_0$  a c-hyperplane with respect to  $y_0$  because if we express x as c<sup>\*</sup>-exp<sub>y0</sub>(q) then

$$H_0 = \mathbf{c}^* - \exp_{u_0}(H_0),$$

or equivalently

$$H_0 = -c_{,y}(\cdot, y_0)(H_0),$$

where

 $\tilde{H}_0 = \{q \in c_{,y}(\cdot, y_0)(\Omega) : c^{x,y}(x_0, y_0)(p_1 - p_0).(q - q_0) = 0\}, \quad q_0 = -c_{,y}(x_0, y_0)$ Therefore,  $H_0$  is the image by c\*-exp<sub>y0</sub> of a hyperplane.

REMARK. We will define in the same way, (replacing 0 by  $\theta$  and  $\theta$  by  $\theta'$ ), the section  $S_{\theta,\theta'}$ , for  $\theta' \in (\theta, 1)$ , and the  $c^*$ -hyperplane,  $H_{\theta} = \lim_{\theta' \to \theta} S_{\theta,\theta'}$ .

The following lemma is then the second main ingredient of the proof: it says that the c-convexity of  $S_{\theta}$  is non-decreasing with respect to  $\theta$ ; (note that the previous lemma asserts that the c-convexity of  $S_{\theta}$ vanishes at  $\theta = 0$ ). **Lemma 2.2.** Assume that c satisfies A3v. Then the second fundamental form of  $\partial S_{\theta}$  at  $x_0$  is non-decreasing with respect to  $\theta$ , for  $\theta$  in (0, 1].

**PROOF.** Consider

$$h_{\theta} = c(x, y_0) - c(x, y_{\theta}) - c(x_0, y_0) + c(x_0, y_{\theta})$$

Note that  $h_{\theta}$  is a defining function for  $S_{\theta}$  in the sense that  $S_{\theta} = \{x \in \Omega : h_{\theta} \leq 0\}.$ 

Note also that at  $x = x_0$  we have  $h_{\theta}(x_0) = 0$  for all  $\theta$  and the set

$$\{\partial_x h_\theta|_{x=x_0}, \theta \in [0,1]\}$$

is a line. Therefore all the sets  $\partial S_{\theta}$  contain  $x_0$  and have the same unit normal at  $x_0$ .

Then we note that property A3v is equivalent to the following: locally around  $x_0$  we have

(1) 
$$h_{\theta} \le \max\{h_1, 0\} + o(|x - x_0|^2).$$

(To see this, we just subtract  $c(x_0, y_0) - c(x, y_0)$  from both sides of the inequality **A3v**).

Then (1) implies that the second fundamental form of  $\partial S_{\theta}$  cannot strictly dominate the second fundamental form of  $\partial S_1$  in any tangential direction at  $x_0$ . By changing  $y_1$  into  $y_{\theta'}$  for  $\theta' \geq \theta$ , this implies that the second fundamental form of  $\partial S_{\theta}$  is non-decreasing with respect to  $\theta$ .

REMARK. We remark that analytically the conclusion of Lemma 2.2 can be expressed as a co-dimension one convexity of the matrix  $A(x,p) = -c_{xx}(x, c-\exp_{x_0}(p))$  with respect to p, in the sense that the quadratic form  $A\xi.\xi$  is convex on line segments in p orthogonal to  $\xi$  or more explicitly:

(2) 
$$\left[A_{ij}(x, p_{\theta}) - (1 - \theta)A_{ij}(x, p_0) - \theta A_{ij}(x, p_1)\right]\xi_i\xi_j \le 0,$$

for all  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\xi \cdot (p_1 - p_0) = 0$ , which, for arbitrary  $y_0, y_1 \in \Omega^*$ , is clearly equivalent to **A3w** when  $c \in C^4$ .

We now deduce assertion (ii) in Theorem 1.2 from A3v; this will be done in several steps.

Step 1. Uniform boundedness of the section's curvature (including c-hyperplanes)

From the previous corollary, it follows that  $\theta \to c_{xx}(x_0, y_\theta)\xi_i\xi_j$  is convex and therefore Lipschitz, and for a.e.  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$A = \partial_{\theta} c_{x_i x_j}(x_0, \operatorname{c-exp}_{x_0}(p_{\theta})) \xi_i \xi_j$$

exists and is equal to  $\lim_{\theta' \to \theta} B(\theta, \theta')$  where

$$B(\theta, \theta') = \frac{\left(c_{x_i x_j}(x_0, \operatorname{c-exp}_{x_0}(p_{\theta'}) - c_{x_i x_j}(x_0, \operatorname{c-exp}_{x_0}(p_{\theta})) \xi_i \xi_j\right)}{\theta' - \theta}$$

The first term A would be the curvature of  $H_{\theta}$  if it exists. The second term B in the limit is the curvature of  $S_{\theta,\theta'}$ . We can deduce right away that the curvature of  $S_{\theta,\theta'}$  remains uniformly bounded at  $x_0$  thanks to (2). Now this reasoning can be extended to any point  $x_1 \in \partial S_{\theta,\theta'}$ , although the c-segment between  $y_{\theta}$  and  $y'_{\theta}$  will be with respect to  $x_1$ , but the conclusion that the curvature of  $S_{\theta,\theta'}$  at  $x_1$  is uniformly bounded remains. Therefore the curvature of all sections is uniformly bounded so as the uniform limit of  $\partial S_{\theta,\theta'}$ ,  $H_{\theta}$  is a  $C^{1,1}$  hypersurface, and therefore has a curvature a.e. given by A.

Step 2. Local convexity Wherever A is well defined, the curvature of  $H_{\theta}$  is equal to A. Moreover, for  $\theta' > \theta$ , the second fundamental form of  $\partial S_{\theta,\theta'}$  dominates a.e. the one of  $H_{\theta}$ .

Let us define the hypersurfaces

$$P_m = \{x \in \Omega, c(x, y_0) - c(x, y_1) = m\}, m \in \mathbb{R}.$$

By standard measure theoretical arguments, the previous result implies the following:

**Lemma 2.3.** For a.e.  $y_0, y_1, m$  there holds at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$  every point  $x_0$  on  $P_m(y_0, y_1)$ , that

- the second fundamental form (SFF) of  $H_0(x_0, y_0, y_1)$  at  $x_0$  is well defined, let us call it A, equivalently  $H_0(x_0, y_0, y_1)$  is twice differentiable (as a hypersurface)
- A is dominated by the SFF of  $\partial S_1(x_0, y_0)$
- going back to the tangent space (i.e. composing with  $c_{,y}(\cdot, y_0)$ ), the second fundamental form of  $c_{,y}(\cdot, y_0)(\partial S_1(x_0, y_0))$  dominates the null form.

We now conclude the local convexity. Starting from a point  $x_0$  where  $H_0$  and  $S_0$  are tangent. Both are defined by  $x_0, y_0, y_1$ . Representing  $\partial S_1$  and  $H_0$  as graphs over  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , and we denote by  $s_1$  and  $s_0$  the corresponding functions. We assume  $x_0 = 0$ , and that both graphs have a flat gradient at 0. For  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  we have

$$s_i(x') = |x'|^2 \int_0^1 \partial_{\nu\nu} s_i(\theta x')(1-\theta) d\theta, \quad i = 0, 1,$$

where  $\nu$  is the appropriate unit vector. By the definition of  $H_0$ , at a given point  $x^* = (x', h_0(x'))$ ,  $H_0$  is tangent to

$$S_1^* = S(x^*, y_0, y_1^*), \quad y_1^* = \operatorname{c-exp}[x^*, -c_x(x^*, y_0) + c_{x,y}(x^*, y_0)c^{x,y}(x_0, y_0)(p_1 - p_0)]$$

For almost every choice of  $x_0$  there will hold for a.e. x' that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\nu\nu} s_0(x') &\leq \partial_{\nu\nu} s_1^*(x') \\ &\leq \partial_{\nu\nu} s_1(x') + \varepsilon(x'-0) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\lim_{0} \varepsilon = 0$ , depending on the continuity of  $c_{xx}, c_{x,y}$ . Therefore

$$s_0(x') \leq |x'|^2 \left( \int_0^1 \partial_{\nu\nu} s_1(\theta x')(1-\theta) d\theta + \varepsilon(x') \right)$$
  
$$\leq s_1(x') + \varepsilon(x'-x_0) |x'|^2.$$

Going now in the tangent space, for q' in a well chosen n-1 subspace, and  $\pi$  the projection on  $\{x_n = 0\}$ , we call  $x(q') = \pi(c^*-\exp(y_0, q'))$  and we have

$$s_0(x(q')) \le s_1(x(q')) + \varepsilon(x(q') - x_0)|x(q')|^2,$$

 $s_0(x(q'))$  is an affine function,  $s_1(x(q'))$  defines the image of  $\partial S_1$  by  $c_{,y}$ and  $\varepsilon(x(q'))|x(q')|^2 \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}(q'))|q'|^2$  for some  $\varepsilon'$ . For a.e. choice of  $x_0$ , this holds for a.e q'. More importantly the  $\varepsilon'$  is (locally) uniform. This implies the convexity through the following lemma

**Lemma 2.4.** Let s be  $C^1$ . Assume that for some continuous  $\varepsilon(\cdot)$  with  $\varepsilon(0) = 0$ , there holds for almost every  $x_0, x$ 

$$s(x) \ge l_{x_0}(x) - \varepsilon(x - x_0)|x - x_0|^2$$

 $l_{x_0}$  being the tangent function at  $x_0$ , then s is convex.

*Proof.* Elementary, both sides of the inequality are continuous in  $x, x_0$ , so this holds in fact everywhere.

REMARK. For a proof of local convexity without using Lemma 2.3 the reader is referred to [3].

Global convexity To complete the proof of assertion (ii), we need to show that the set  $\tilde{S}_1$  is connected. The proof goes as follows, and it is very close to the argument of [8], Section 2.5. Let  $\sigma$  be a constant, and assuming that the set

$$\{c(x, y_0) - c(x, y_1) \le \sigma\}$$

has two disjoint components, we let  $\sigma$  increase until the two components touch in a  $C^1$  c -convex subdomain  $\Omega' \subset \subset \Omega$ . From the local convexity property this can only happen on the boundary of  $\Omega'$ . At this point, say  $x_1$  there holds locally that

$$c(x, y_0) - c(x, y_1) \le \sigma$$

on  $\partial \Omega'$  and for  $x^{\varepsilon} = x_1 - \varepsilon \nu$ ,  $\nu$  the outer unit normal to  $\Omega'$ ,

$$c(x^{\varepsilon}, y_0) - c(x^{\varepsilon}, y_1) > h.$$

This implies that

$$c(x, y_0) - c(x, y_1) \ge h$$

is locally c-convex around  $x_1$ , a contradiction, and from this we deduce that  $S_1$  can have at most one component. Since a connected locally convex set in Euclidean space must be globally convex, we thus deduce that  $S_1$  is globally c-convex.

2.1. An analytical proof for a smooth cost function. If a  $C^2$  domain  $\Omega$  is defined locally by  $\varphi > 0$ , its local c-convexity with respect to  $y_0$ , for  $c \in C^3$ , is expressed by

$$\left[\varphi_{ij} + c_{ij,k}c^{k,l}(\cdot, y_0)\partial_l\varphi\right]\tau_i\tau_j \ge 0,$$

or equivalently

$$\left[\varphi_{ij} + \partial_p A^{ij} . \partial\varphi\right] \tau_i \tau_j \ge 0$$

for all  $\tau \in \partial \Omega$  [7]. Plugging  $\varphi(x) = c(x, y_0) - c(x, y_1) - h$  into this inequality, we obtain immediately from (2) that  $S_1$  is locally *c*-convex with respect to  $y_0$ . More generally this argument proves Theorem 1.2 when we assume additionally that the form  $A\xi.\xi$  is differentiable with respect to p in directions orthogonal to  $\xi$ .

2.2. Connectedness of the contact set. This new characterization implies right away the *c*-convexity of the global *c*-sub-differential, (*c*-normal mapping). We prove now that (i) implies (iii).

For  $\phi$  c-convex, we have

(3) 
$$\phi(x) = \sup_{y} \{-\phi^{c}(y) - c(x,y)\},$$

(4) 
$$\phi^{c}(y) = \sup_{x} \{-\phi(x) - c(x,y)\}.$$

Then

$$\{ \phi(x) \le -c(x, y_0) + h \} = \bigcap_y \{ x : -\phi^c(y) - c(x, y) \le -c(x, y_0) + h \}$$
  
=  $\bigcap_y \{ x : c(x, y_0) \le c(x, y) - h + \phi^c(y) \}.$ 

Therefore  $\{\phi(x) \leq -c(x, y_0) + h\}$  is an intersection of c-convex sets and hence also c-convex. We then have

$$G_{\phi}(y) = \{x, \phi(x) = -c(x, y) - \phi^{c}(y)\} \\ = \{x, \phi(x) \le -c(x, y) - \phi^{c}(y)\},\$$

and hence  $G_{\phi}(y)$  is a c-convex set. To show the dual conclusion, we may rewrite assertion (ii) as: for all  $y, y_1 \in \Omega^*$ ,  $x_0, x_1 \in \Omega^*$  and  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , with

$$c_y(x_{\theta}, y) = \theta c_y(x_1, y) + (1 - \theta) c_y(x_0, y)$$

there holds

$$\max\{-c(x_0, y) + c(x_0, y_0), -c(x_1, y) + c(x_1, y_0)\} \\ \ge -c(x_{\theta}, y) + c(x_{\theta}, y_0).$$

Since this shows in particular that **A3v** is invariant under duality we complete the proof of assertion (iii). Moreover as a byproduct of this argument we also see that the sets  $S_{\theta}$  are non-increasing with respect to  $\theta$  and that **A3v** holds without the term  $o(|x - x_0|^2)$ .

2.3. Local implies global. We prove that (ii) implies (iv). We consider  $\phi$  a locally c-convex function, i.e,  $\phi$  has at every point a local c-support. Locally,  $\phi$  can be expressed as

$$\phi(x) = \sup_{y \in \omega} \{-\psi(y) - c(x, y)\},\$$

for some  $\omega(x) \subset \Omega^*$  (if  $\phi$  was globally c-convex there would hold that  $\omega \equiv \Omega^*$  and  $\psi$  would be equal to  $\phi^c$ ). It follows that the level sets

$$S_{m,y_0} = \{x : \phi(x) + c(x,y_0) \le m\}$$

are locally c-convex with respect to  $y_0$  for any  $y_0$ . We obtain that  $-\partial_y c(S_{m,y_0}, y_0)$  is locally convex. Reasoning again as in the proof of the global convexity in point (*ii*) (i.e. increasing *m* until two components touch), we obtain that, for  $\phi$  locally c-convex,  $-\partial_y c(S_{m,y_0}, y_0)$  is globally convex for all  $y_0$ . This implies in turn the global c-convexity of  $\phi$ , following Proposition 2.12 of [2]. As already mentioned, this part is very similar to the argument of [7], section 2.5.

Finally we remark that the arguments in this paper extend to generating functions as introduced in [6] and also provide as a byproduct an alternative geometric proof of the invariance of condition A3w under duality to the more complicated calculation in [6]. The resultant convexity theory is presented in [3].

## References

- Y.-H. Kim and R. J. McCann. Continuity, curvature, and the general covariance of optimal transportation. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 12:1009–1040, 2010.
- [2] G. Loeper. On the regularity of solutions of optimal transportation problems. Acta Mathematica, 202(2):241–283, 2009.
- [3] G. Loeper and N.S. Trudinger. On the convexity theory of generating functions. *in preparation*.
- [4] G. Loeper and C. Villani. Regularity of optimal transport in curved geometry: the non-focal case. *Duke Math. Journal*, 151(3):431–485, 2010.
- [5] X.-N. Ma, N.S. Trudinger, and X.-J. Wang. Regularity of potential functions of the optimal transport problem. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 177(2):151–183, 2005.
- [6] N.S. Trudinger. On the local theory of prescribed Jacobian equations. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 34(4):1663–1681, 2014.

- [7] N.S. Trudinger and X.-J. Wang. On strict convexity and continuous differentiability of potential functions in optimal transportation. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 192(3):403–418, 2009.
- [8] N.S. Trudinger and X.-J. Wang. On the second boundary value problem for Monge-Ampère type equations and optimal transportation. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci., 5(8):143–174, 2009.

Gregoire Loeper Monash University School of Mathematics 9 Rainforest Walk 3800 CLAYTON VIC, AUSTRALIA

email: gregoire.loeper@monash.edu