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#### 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 $\phi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define its c-transform $\phi^{c}: \Omega^{*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

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

Conversely we define the $c^{*}$ - transform of $\psi: \Omega^{*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. 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

$$
\forall x^{\prime} \in \Omega, \phi\left(x^{\prime}\right) \geq-\psi(y)-c\left(x^{\prime}, y\right)
$$

with equality at $x^{\prime}=x$. 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 $\psi: \Omega^{*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. 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

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

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, $\mathbf{A 3}, \mathbf{A} 3 \mathbf{w}$ 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

[^0]$c$ is globally $C^{2}\left(\Omega \times \Omega^{*}\right)$, 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 $c^{x, y}=\left[c^{i, j}\right]$ to denote the inverse of the matrix $c_{x, y}=\left[c_{i, j}\right]$. We further assume throughout the paper that $c$ satisfies the assumptions A1, A2 of [5], that is for all $x \in \Omega$ the mapping $y \rightarrow-c_{x}(x, y)$ 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

$$
c_{x}\left(x, y_{\theta}\right)=\theta c_{x}\left(x, y_{1}\right)+(1-\theta) c_{x}\left(x, y_{0}\right),
$$

there holds

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \max \left\{-c\left(x, y_{0}\right)+c\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right),-c\left(x, y_{1}\right)+c\left(x_{0}, y_{1}\right)\right\} \\
\geq & -c\left(x, y_{\theta}\right)+c\left(x_{0}, y_{\theta}\right)+o\left(\left|x-x_{0}\right|^{2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the term $o\left(\left|x-x_{0}\right|^{2}\right)$ may depend on $\theta$.
From [2] it is known that when the cost function is $C^{4}, \mathbf{A} \mathbf{3 v}$ is equivalent to A3w.

Our main result is the following:
Theorem 1.2. Let $c: \Omega \times \Omega^{*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a $C^{2}$ cost-function satisfying A1, A2 with $\Omega, \Omega^{*} c$-convex with respect to each other. Assume that
(i) $c$ satisfies $\mathbf{A} 3 \mathbf{v}$.

## Then

(ii) for all $y_{0}, y_{1} \in \Omega^{*}, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $U=\left\{x \in \Omega: c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-\right.$ $\left.c\left(x, y_{1}\right) \leq \sigma\right\}$ is $c$-convex with respect to $y_{0}$,
(iii) for all $\phi$-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

$$
y=\operatorname{c}_{-\exp _{x}(p)}^{\Leftrightarrow} \underset{2}{\Leftrightarrow}-c_{x}(x, y)=p
$$

We recall also that

$$
D_{p}\left(\mathrm{c}-\exp _{x}\right)=-c^{x, y} .
$$

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 $y_{\theta}=c$-exp $x_{x_{0}} p_{\theta}$ where $p_{\theta}=(1-\theta) c_{x}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+\theta c_{x}\left(x_{0}, y_{1}\right), 0 \leq \theta \leq$ 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,
$S_{\theta}=S\left(x_{0}, y_{0}, y_{\theta}\right):=\left\{x \in \Omega: c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \leq c\left(x, y_{\theta}\right)-c\left(x_{0}, y_{\theta}\right)\right\}$.
Then as $\theta$ approaches $0, \partial S_{\theta} \cap \Omega$ converges to $H_{0}$, the $c^{*}$-hyperplane with respect to $y_{0}$, passing through $x_{0}$, with $c$-normal vector $p_{1}-p_{0}$, given by
$H_{0}=H_{0}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}, y_{1}\right)=\left\{x \in \Omega:-c^{x, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\left(p_{1}-p_{0}\right) \cdot\left[c_{, y}\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c_{, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right]=0\right\}$
Proof. Locally around $\theta=0$, the equation of $\partial S_{\theta}$ reads

$$
\left[c_{, y}\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c_{, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right] \cdot\left(y_{\theta}-y_{0}\right)=o(\theta)
$$

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

$$
\left[c_{, y}\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c_{, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right] \cdot \partial_{\theta} y_{\theta}=0
$$

which gives the desired result, since

$$
\partial_{\theta} y_{\theta}=-c^{x, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\left(p_{1}-p_{0}\right) .
$$

Remark. We call $H_{0}$ a c-hyperplane with respect to $y_{0}$ because if we express $x$ as $\mathrm{c}^{*}-\exp _{y_{0}}(q)$ then

$$
H_{0}=\mathrm{c}^{*}-\exp _{y_{0}}\left(\tilde{H}_{0}\right),
$$

or equivalently

$$
\tilde{H}_{0}=-c_{, y}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)\left(H_{0}\right),
$$

where
$\tilde{H}_{0}=\left\{q \in c_{, y}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)(\Omega): c^{x, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\left(p_{1}-p_{0}\right) \cdot\left(q-q_{0}\right)=0\right\}, \quad q_{0}=-c_{, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$
Therefore, $H_{0}$ is the image by $c^{*}-\exp _{y_{0}}$ of a hyperplane.

Remark. We will define in the same way, (replacing 0 by $\theta$ and $\theta$ by $\theta^{\prime}$ ), the section $S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}$, for $\theta^{\prime} \in(\theta, 1)$, and the $c^{*}$-hyperplane, $H_{\theta}=$ $\lim _{\theta^{\prime} \rightarrow \theta} S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}$.

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

$$
h_{\theta}=c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x, y_{\theta}\right)-c\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)+c\left(x_{0}, y_{\theta}\right) .
$$

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

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

$$
\left\{\left.\partial_{x} h_{\theta}\right|_{x=x_{0}}, \theta \in[0,1]\right\}
$$

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 $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{3 v}$ is equivalent to the following: locally around $x_{0}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{\theta} \leq \max \left\{h_{1}, 0\right\}+o\left(\left|x-x_{0}\right|^{2}\right) . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(To see this, we just subtract $c\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x, y_{0}\right)$ 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 $y_{\theta^{\prime}}$ for $\theta^{\prime} \geq \theta$, 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 $A(x, p)=-c_{x x}\left(x, \mathrm{c}-\exp _{x_{0}}(p)\right)$ 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:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[A_{i j}\left(x, p_{\theta}\right)-(1-\theta) A_{i j}\left(x, p_{0}\right)-\theta A_{i j}\left(x, p_{1}\right)\right] \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \leq 0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that $\xi \cdot\left(p_{1}-p_{0}\right)=0$, which, for arbitrary $y_{0}, y_{1} \in \Omega^{*}$, is clearly equivalent to $\mathbf{A} 3 \mathbf{w}$ 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 chyperplanes)
From the previous corollary, it follows that $\theta \rightarrow c_{x x}\left(x_{0}, y_{\theta}\right) \xi_{i} \xi_{j}$ is convex and therefore Lipschitz, and for a.e. $\theta \in[0,1]$,

$$
A=\partial_{\theta} c_{x_{i} x_{j}}\left(x_{0}, c-\exp _{x_{0}}\left(p_{\theta}\right)\right) \xi_{i} \xi_{j}
$$

exists and is equal to $\lim _{\theta^{\prime} \rightarrow \theta} B\left(\theta, \theta^{\prime}\right)$ where

$$
B\left(\theta, \theta^{\prime}\right)=\frac{\left(c _ { x _ { i } x _ { j } } \left(x_{0}, \mathrm{c}^{-\exp _{x_{0}}}\left(p_{\theta^{\prime}}\right)-c_{x_{i} x_{j}}\left(x_{0}, \mathrm{c}-\exp _{x_{0}}\left(p_{\theta}\right)\right) \xi_{i} \xi_{j}\right.\right.}{\theta^{\prime}-\theta}
$$

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 $S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}$. We can deduce right away that the curvature of $S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}$ remains uniformly bounded at $x_{0}$ thanks to (2). Now this reasoning can be extended to any point $x_{1} \in \partial S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}$, although the c-segment between $y_{\theta}$ and $y_{\theta}^{\prime}$ will be with respect to $x_{1}$, but the conclusion that the curvature of $S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}$ at $x_{1}$ is uniformly bounded remains. Therefore the curvature of all sections is uniformly bounded so as the uniform limit of $\partial S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}, H_{\theta}$ 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 $\theta^{\prime}>\theta$, the second fundamental form of $\partial S_{\theta, \theta^{\prime}}$ dominates a.e. the one of $H_{\theta}$.

Let us define the hypersurfaces

$$
P_{m}=\left\{x \in \Omega, c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x, y_{1}\right)=m\right\}, m \in \mathbb{R}
$$

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 $P_{m}\left(y_{0}, y_{1}\right)$, that

- the second fundamental form (SFF) of $H_{0}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}, y_{1}\right)$ at $x_{0}$ is well defined, let us call it $A$, equivalently $H_{0}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}, y_{1}\right)$ is twice differentiable (as a hypersurface)
- $A$ is dominated by the SFF of $\partial S_{1}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)$
- going back to the tangent space (i.e. composing with $c_{, y}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)$ ), the second fundamental form of $c_{, y}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right)\left(\partial S_{1}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right)$ 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 $x^{\prime} \in R^{n-1}$ we have

$$
s_{i}\left(x^{\prime}\right)=\left|x^{\prime}\right|^{2} \int_{0}^{1} \partial_{\nu \nu} s_{i}\left(\theta x^{\prime}\right)(1-\theta) d \theta, \quad i=0,1,
$$

where $\nu$ is the appropriate unit vector. By the definition of $H_{0}$, at a given point $x^{*}=\left(x^{\prime}, h_{0}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right)$, $H_{0}$ is tangent to
$S_{1}^{*}=S\left(x^{*}, y_{0}, y_{1}^{*}\right), \quad y_{1}^{*}=\mathrm{c}-\exp \left[x^{*},-c_{x}\left(x^{*}, y_{0}\right)+c_{x, y}\left(x^{*}, y_{0}\right) c^{x, y}\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\left(p_{1}-p_{0}\right)\right]$.

For almost every choice of $x_{0}$ there will hold for a.e. $x^{\prime}$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_{\nu \nu} s_{0}\left(x^{\prime}\right) & \leq \partial_{\nu \nu} s_{1}^{*}\left(x^{\prime}\right) \\
& \leq \partial_{\nu \nu} s_{1}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+\varepsilon\left(x^{\prime}-0\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

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

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_{0}\left(x^{\prime}\right) & \leq\left|x^{\prime}\right|^{2}\left(\int_{0}^{1} \partial_{\nu \nu} s_{1}\left(\theta x^{\prime}\right)(1-\theta) d \theta+\varepsilon\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& \leq s_{1}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+\varepsilon\left(x^{\prime}-x_{0}\right)\left|x^{\prime}\right|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

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

$$
s_{0}\left(x\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq s_{1}\left(x\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right)+\varepsilon\left(x\left(q^{\prime}\right)-x_{0}\right)\left|x\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2},
$$

$s_{0}\left(x\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is an affine function, $s_{1}\left(x\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right)$ defines the image of $\partial S_{1}$ by $c_{, y}$ and $\left.\varepsilon\left(x\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right)\left|x\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right|^{2} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(q^{\prime}\right)\right)\left|q^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ for some $\varepsilon^{\prime}$. For a.e. choice of $x_{0}$, this holds for a.e $q^{\prime}$. More importantly the $\varepsilon^{\prime}$ is (locally) uniform. This implies the convexity through the following lemma
Lemma 2.4. Let $s$ be $C^{1}$. Assume that for some continous $\varepsilon(\cdot)$ with $\varepsilon(0)=0$, there holds for almost every $x_{0}, x$

$$
s(x) \geq l_{x_{0}}(x)-\varepsilon\left(x-x_{0}\right)\left|x-x_{0}\right|^{2}
$$

$l_{x_{0}}$ 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

$$
\left\{c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x, y_{1}\right) \leq \sigma\right\}
$$

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

$$
c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x, y_{1}\right) \leq \sigma
$$

on $\partial \Omega^{\prime}$ and for $x^{\varepsilon}=x_{1}-\varepsilon \nu, \nu$ the outer unit normal to $\Omega^{\prime}$,

$$
c\left(x^{\varepsilon}, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x^{\varepsilon}, y_{1}\right)>h .
$$

This implies that

$$
c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x, y_{1}\right) \geq h
$$

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

$$
\left[\varphi_{i j}+c_{i j, k} k^{k, l}\left(\cdot, y_{0}\right) \partial_{l} \varphi\right] \tau_{i} \tau_{j} \geq 0
$$

or equivalently

$$
\left[\varphi_{i j}+\partial_{p} A^{i j} . \partial \varphi\right] \tau_{i} \tau_{j} \geq 0
$$

for all $\tau \in \partial \Omega$ [7]. Plugging $\varphi(x)=c\left(x, y_{0}\right)-c\left(x, y_{1}\right)-h$ 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

$$
\begin{align*}
\phi(x) & =\sup _{y}\left\{-\phi^{c}(y)-c(x, y)\right\},  \tag{3}\\
\phi^{c}(y) & =\sup _{x}\{-\phi(x)-c(x, y)\} . \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\{\phi(x) \leq-c\left(x, y_{0}\right)+h\right\} & =\cap_{y}\left\{x:-\phi^{c}(y)-c(x, y) \leq-c\left(x, y_{0}\right)+h\right\} \\
& =\cap_{y}\left\{x: c\left(x, y_{0}\right) \leq c(x, y)-h+\phi^{c}(y)\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\left\{\phi(x) \leq-c\left(x, y_{0}\right)+h\right\}$ is an intersection of c-convex sets and hence also c-convex. We then have

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{\phi}(y) & =\left\{x, \phi(x)=-c(x, y)-\phi^{c}(y)\right\} \\
& =\left\{x, \phi(x) \leq-c(x, y)-\phi^{c}(y)\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

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

$$
c_{y}\left(x_{\theta}, y\right)=\theta c_{y}\left(x_{1}, \underset{7}{y)}+(1-\theta) c_{y}\left(x_{0}, y\right),\right.
$$

there holds

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \max \left\{-c\left(x_{0}, y\right)+c\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right),-c\left(x_{1}, y\right)+c\left(x_{1}, y_{0}\right)\right\} \\
\geq & -c\left(x_{\theta}, y\right)+c\left(x_{\theta}, y_{0}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since this shows in particular that $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{3 v}$ 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 $\mathbf{A 3 v}$ holds without the term $o\left(\left|x-x_{0}\right|^{2}\right)$.
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 $\left.\phi^{c}\right)$. It follows that the level sets

$$
S_{m, y_{0}}=\left\{x: \phi(x)+c\left(x, y_{0}\right) \leq m\right\}
$$

are locally c-convex with respect to $y_{0}$ for any $y_{0}$. We obtain that $-\partial_{y} c\left(S_{m, y_{0}}, y_{0}\right)$ 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, $-\partial_{y} c\left(S_{m, y_{0}}, y_{0}\right)$ 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].
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