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Abstract

The notion of the angle between two subspaces has a long history, dating back to Friedrichs’s work in 1937 and Dixmier’s work on the minimal angle in 1949. In 2006, Deutsch and Hundal studied extensions to convex sets in order to analyze convergence rates for the cyclic projections algorithm.

In this work, we characterize when the minimal angle of two convex cones is positive. We obtain existence results and necessary conditions for the principal vectors of two convex subsets as well. Moreover, we investigate the relation between the intersection of two nonlinear cones and the intersection of the polar and dual cone of the underlying cones, which yields that the two angles involved cannot be both positive. Several results by Deutsch and Hundal on angles and minimal angles are generalized from linear subspaces to cones. These generalizations yield sufficient conditions for the closedness of the sum of two convex cones, and they relate to conditions proposed by Beutner and by Seeger and Sossa. We also obtain some identities on angles of two nonempty closed convex cones and their polar and dual cones. Various examples illustrate the sharpness of our results.
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1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we shall assume that

\[ \mathcal{H} \text{ is a real Hilbert space,} \]

with inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) and induced norm \( \| \cdot \| \). Moreover, we assume that \( \mathcal{H} \neq 0 \) and that \( m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \), where \( \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \).

The angle and minimal angle between two closed linear subspaces were first introduced by Friedrichs [10] in 1937 and by Dixmier [8] in 1949, respectively. (We recommend the nice expository paper [4] for details on the angle and minimal angle between linear subspaces.) In order to characterize the rate of convergence of the cyclic projections algorithm for the intersection of finitely many closed convex sets in Hilbert spaces, Deutsch and Hundal generalized these definitions from linear subspaces to general convex sets in [6]. In fact, they showed that the rate of convergence for the cyclic projections algorithm onto an intersection of finitely many closed convex sets can be described by the “norm” of the composition of projectors onto certain sets constructed by these convex sets (see, [6, Theorem 5.21]). Moreover, for two closed convex sets with intersection including 0, they found that the cosine of the
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minimal angle between these two sets is identical to the norm of the composition of projectors onto these two sets (see, [6, Theorems 2.5 and 5.5]). Hence, the study of positive minimal angles is useful.

In addition, to extend the Iusem-Seeger theory of critical angles from one convex cone to a pair of convex cones, Seeger and Sossa introduced and investigated the maximal angle between two closed convex cones in [13]. It was pointed out in [13, page 46] that angle minimization problems arise in a number of applications, for instance in the theory of exponential dichotomies for linear ODEs and in regression analysis of ordinal data. In fact, by Fact 3.1, the “minimal angle” mentioned in [13] is actually different from the minimal angle studied in [6] and this work, but these two angles are consistent when both of them are in $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.

Motivated by the applications of the angle and minimal angle between two convex cones presented in [6] and [13], we generalize results on angles between linear subspaces in [4, Section 2] to convex sets. Let us present our main results:

**R1:** In Theorem 3.2, we provide equivalent expressions for the cosine of the minimal angle between two closed convex sets. This yields characterizations of the positivity of the minimal angle (see Theorem 4.5).

**R2:** As an generalization of [4, Theorem 2.12(1)⇒(2)], Theorem 4.6 states that if the angle between two nonempty closed convex cones is positive, then the vector difference of the cones is closed.

As an application of Theorem 4.6, we provide in Corollary 4.7 sufficient conditions for the closedness of the sum of two cones. In particular, some of these conditions reduce to the sufficient conditions in [3, Theorem 3.2] and [13, Proposition 4.1].

**R3:** Theorem 4.10 illustrates that under some assumptions (e.g., when $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional), $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ implies that $K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus \neq \{0\}$, which shows that $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$ and $c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) < 1$ cannot occur simultaneously.

**R4:** By generalizing [4, Lemma 2.14 and Theorems 2.15 and 2.16] from linear subspaces to cones, we provide identities on angles in Theorems 5.3 and 5.4.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some basic results that will be used in the next sections. In Section 3, we provide equivalent expressions for the cosine of minimal angle between two nonempty convex sets and show necessary conditions for the pair of principal vectors. Using the equivalent expressions for the cosine of minimal angle between two nonempty convex sets given in Section 3, we characterize the cosine of minimal angle between two nonempty closed convex cones being strictly less than 1 in Section 4. Moreover, in Section 4, we show also sufficient conditions for the closedness of the sum of two closed convex cones and consider the relation between the intersection of nonempty closed convex cones $K_1$ and $K_1$ and the intersection of $K_1^\ominus$ and $K_2^\ominus$. In the Section 5, we mainly generalize results in [4, Lemma 2.14 and Theorems 2.15 and 2.16] on relations between angles of linear subspaces and of their orthogonal complementary subspaces from linear subspaces to cones. Multiple counterexamples are constructed to further investigate some earlier results in Section 6.

We now turn to the notation used in this paper. Let $D$ be a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{H}$. The closure of $D$ is the smallest closed set that contains $D$; it is denoted by $\overline{D}$. The polar cone (or negative dual cone) of $D$ is the set $D^\ominus := \{u \in \mathcal{H} : \langle x, u \rangle \leq 0\}$. The (positive) dual cone of $D$ is the set $D^\oplus := -D^\ominus$. The orthogonal complement of $D$ is the set $D^\perp := D^\ominus \cap D^\oplus = \{x \in \mathcal{H} | \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } y \in D\}$. Denote by $\mathbb{R}_+ := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda \geq 0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda > 0\}$. A subset $K$ of $\mathcal{H}$ is a cone if $K = \mathbb{R}_+ K$. The conical hull of $D$ is the intersection of all the cones in $\mathcal{H}$ containing $D$, i.e., the smallest cones in $\mathcal{H}$ containing $D$. It is denoted by $\text{cone} D$. The closed conical hull of $D$ is the smallest closed cone in $\mathcal{H}$ containing $D$. It is denoted by $\overline{\text{cone}} D$. Because we shall use results on conical hull in both [2] and [5], we point out that by [2, Proposition 6.2(iii)], when $D$ is a convex set, the definitions of conical hull in [2, Definition 6.1] presented above and the one shown in [5, Page 45] are consistent. Moreover, by [2, Proposition 6.2(iii)], $\overline{\text{cone}} D = \overline{\text{cone}} D$. Let $C$ be a nonempty closed convex subset of $\mathcal{H}$. The projector
(or projection operator) onto \( C \) is the operator, denoted by \( P_C \), that maps every point in \( H \) to its unique projection onto \( C \). Moreover, \((\forall x \in H)\ d_C(x) := \min_{c \in C} \|x - c\| = \|x - P_C x\|\). Suppose that \( D \) is a nonempty closed convex subset of \( H \) as well. Denote \( d(C, D) := \inf\{\|x - y\| : x \in C, y \in D\} \). Set \( B_H := \{x \in H : \|x\| \leq 1\} \) and \( S_H := \{x \in H : \|x\| = 1\} \).

For other notation not explicitly defined here, we refer the reader to [2].

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we collect some results that will be used in the sequel.

### Cones and projectors

**Fact 2.1.** [2, Proposition 6.2(i)] Let \( C \) be a subset of \( H \). Then cone \( C = \mathbb{R}_{++} C \).

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( K \) be a nonempty convex cone. Then the following hold:

(i) \( K + K = K \).

(ii) If \( -K \subseteq K \), then \( K \) is a linear subspace.

**Proof.** (i): Let \( x \in K \). Because \( K \) is a cone, we have that \( x = \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}x \in K + K \). So, \( K \subseteq K + K \). On the other hand, let \( x \in K \) and \( y \in K \). Because \( K \) is convex, \( \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}y \in K \). Hence, \( x + y = 2\left(\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}y \right) \in K \), since \( K \) is a cone. Therefore, we have also \( K + K \subseteq K \). Altogether, (i) holds.

(ii): Because \( K \) is a cone, by Fact 2.1, \( K = \mathbb{R}_{++} K \). Combine this with the assumption, \( -K \subseteq K \), and (i) to obtain that \( K \) is a linear subspace. \( \square \)

**Fact 2.3.** [5, Theorem 4.5] Let \( C \) be a nonempty subset of \( H \). Then the following hold:

(i) \( C^\ominus \) is a closed convex cone and \( C^\perp \) is a closed linear subspace.

(ii) \( C^\ominus = (\overline{\text{cone}(C)})^\ominus = (\text{cone}(C))^\ominus \).

(iii) \( C^\ominus \ominus = \text{cone}(C) \).

(iv) If \( C \) is a closed convex cone, then \( C^\ominus \ominus = C \).

(v) Assume that \( C \) is a linear subspace. Then \( C^\ominus = C^\perp \). In addition, if \( C \) is closed, then \( C = C^\ominus \ominus = C^\perp \perp \).

**Fact 2.4.** [5, Theorem 4.6] Let \( K_1, \ldots, K_m \) be closed convex cones in \( H \). Then \( (\cap_{i=1}^m K_i)^\ominus = \sum_{i=1}^m K_i^\ominus \).

**Lemma 2.5.** Let \( C \) be a nonempty subset of \( H \). Then the following statements hold:

(i) \( (-C)^\ominus = -C = C^\ominus \).

(ii) \( C^\ominus \ominus = \overline{\text{cone}(C)} \).

(iii) Assume that \( C \) is a linear subspace of \( H \). Then \( C^\perp = C^\ominus = C^\oplus \).

**Proof.** (i): By definition of polar cone and dual cone, it is clear that \( -C^\ominus = C^\ominus \). Let \( x \in H \). Then

\[ x \in (-C)^\ominus \iff (\forall c \in C) \quad \langle x, -c \rangle \leq 0 \iff (\forall c \in C) \quad \langle -x, c \rangle \leq 0 \iff -x \in C^\ominus \iff x \in -C^\ominus, \]

which implies that \( (-C)^\ominus = -C^\ominus \).

(ii): Using (i) above and Fact 2.3(iii), we see that \( C^\ominus \ominus = (C^\ominus)^\ominus = (-C^\ominus)^\ominus = C^\ominus \ominus = \overline{\text{cone}(C)} \).

(iii): By Fact 2.3(i)&(v), clearly \( C^\ominus = -C^\ominus = -C^\perp = C^\perp = C^\ominus \). \( \square \)
Lemma 2.6. Let $A$ and $B$ be nonempty subsets of $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $0 \in B$ and that $A \subseteq B^\perp$. Then $(A + B) \cap B^\ominus = A$.

Consequently, if $B$ is a linear subspace, and $A \subseteq B^\perp$, then $(A + B) \cap B^\perp = A$.

Proof. Note that $B^\perp = B^\ominus \cap B^\ominus$. Because $0 \in B$ and $A \subseteq B^\ominus$, we have that $A \subseteq (A + B) \cap B^\ominus$. Conversely, let $x \in (A + B) \cap B^\ominus$. Then there exists $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ such that $x = a + b \in B^\ominus$. Because $x \in B^\ominus$, $b \in B$, and $a \in A \subseteq B^\ominus \cap B^\ominus$, we know that $\langle x, b \rangle \leq 0$, and that $\langle a, b \rangle = 0$. Combine these results with $0 \geq \langle x, b \rangle = \langle a + b, b \rangle = \langle a, b \rangle + \|b\|^2 = \|b\|^2$ to see that $b = 0$. Hence, $(A + B) \cap B^\ominus \subseteq A$. Altogether, $A = (A + B) \cap B^\ominus$.

For the last assertion, by Lemma 2.5(iii), $B$ is a linear subspace implies that $B^\perp = B^\ominus = B^\ominus$.

Fact 2.7. [2, Theorem 3.16] Let $C$ be a nonempty closed convex subset of $\mathcal{H}$. Let $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Then there is exactly one best approximation to $x$ from $C$. Moreover, for every $p$ in $\mathcal{H}$,

$$p = P_C x \iff [p \in C \text{ and } (\forall y \in C) (y - p, x - p) \leq 0].$$

Fact 2.8. [2, Propositions 6.28] Let $K$ be a nonempty closed convex cone in $\mathcal{H}$ and let $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Let $p \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $p = P_K x \iff [p \in K, x - p \perp p, \text{ and } x - p \in K^\ominus]$.

Angles between convex sets

Definition 2.9. [6, Definitions 2.3 and 3.2] Let $C$ and $D$ be nonempty convex sets in $\mathcal{H}$. The *minimal angle* between $C$ and $D$ is the angle in $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ whose cosine is given by

$$c_0(C, D) := \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in \text{cone}(C) \cap B_\mathcal{H}, y \in \text{cone}(D) \cap B_\mathcal{H} \}.$$

In addition, the *angle* between $C$ and $D$ is the angle in $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ whose cosine is given by

$$c(C, D) := c_0((\text{cone} C) \cap (\overline{C^\ominus + D^\ominus}), (\text{cone} D) \cap (\overline{C^\ominus + D^\ominus})).$$

Because for every nonempty convex set $C$, $\text{cone}(C) = \overline{\text{cone}(C)} = \overline{\text{cone}(\text{cone} C)}$, although [6, Lemma 2.4] shows only $c_0(C, D) = c_0(\overline{\text{cone}(C)}, \overline{\text{cone}(D)})$, in the following Fact 2.10(iii) we present $c_0(C, D) = c_0(\overline{C}, \overline{D}) = c_0(\text{cone}(C), \text{cone}(D)) = c_0(\overline{\text{cone}(C)}, \overline{\text{cone}(D)})$. Therefore, it is clear that when $\overline{C^\ominus + D^\ominus} = \mathcal{H}$, then $c(C, D) = c_0(\text{cone}(C), \text{cone}(D)) = c_0(C, D)$.

Fact 2.10. [6, Lemma 2.4, Theorem 2.5 and Proposition 3.3] Let $C$ and $D$ be nonempty convex sets of $\mathcal{H}$. Then:

(i) $c_0(C, D) \in [0, 1]$ and $c(C, D) \in [0, 1]$.

(ii) $(\forall x \in \overline{\text{cone}(C)}) (\forall y \in \overline{\text{cone}(D)}) \langle x, y \rangle \leq c_0(C, D) \|x\| \|y\|$.

(iii) $c_0(C, D) = c_0(D, C) = c_0(\overline{C}, \overline{D}) = c_0(\text{cone}(C), \text{cone}(D)) = c_0(\overline{\text{cone}(C)}, \overline{\text{cone}(D)})$.

In the following result, using the Fact 2.10(ii), we generalize [4, Lemma 2.10(2)] from two linear subspaces to one cone and one linear subspace.

Lemma 2.11. Let $K$ be a nonempty closed convex cone in $\mathcal{H}$ and let $M$ be a nonempty closed linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$(\forall x \in K)(\forall y \in M) \quad |\langle x, y \rangle| \leq c_0(K, M) \|x\| \|y\|.$$

Proof. Let $x \in K$ and $y \in M$. Apply Fact 2.10(ii) with $C = M$ and $D = K$ to obtain that $\langle x, y \rangle \leq c_0(K, M) \|x\| \|y\|$.

On the other hand, note that $y \in M$ and $M$ is a linear subspace yield that $-y \in M$. Hence, by Definition 2.9, we obtain that $\langle x, -y \rangle \leq c_0(K, M) \|x\| \|y\|$.
Lemma 2.12. Let $C$ and $D$ be nonempty convex subsets of $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following hold:

(i) Let $U$ and $V$ be nonempty convex subsets of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $C \subseteq U$ and $D \subseteq V$. Then $c_0(C, D) \leq c_0(U, V)$.

(ii) $c_0(C, D) = c_0(-C, -D), c_0(-C, D) = c_0(C, -D), c(C, D) = c(-C, -D)$, and $c(-C, D) = c(C, -D)$.

(iii) Suppose that $(\text{cone}(C) \cap \text{cone}(D)) \nless \{0\} \neq \emptyset$. Then $c_0(C, D) = 1$.

(iv) $0 \leq c(C, D) \leq c_0(C, D) \leq 1$.

Proof. (i): This follows easily from Definition 2.9.

(ii): Note that for every nonempty convex subset $A$ of $\mathcal{H}$, $\overline{\text{cone}}(-A) = -\overline{\text{cone}}A$. Hence, by Definition 2.9, it is easy to see that

$$c_0(C, D) = c_0(-C, -D) \quad \text{and} \quad c_0(-C, D) = c_0(C, -D) \quad (2.1)$$

In addition, by Lemma 2.5(i), clearly, $-C^\oplus + (D)^\ominus = -(C^\oplus + D^\ominus) = -C^\oplus + D^\ominus$. Hence, by (2.1) and Definition 2.9, we obtain that $c(C, D) = c(-C, -D)$, and $c(-C, D) = c(C, -D)$.

(iii): Take $x \in \text{cone}(C) \cap \text{cone}(D) \setminus \{0\}$. Then by Fact 2.1, $\frac{x}{\|x\|} \in (\text{cone}(C) \cap B_H) \cap (\text{cone}(D) \cap B_H)$. Combine this with Definition 2.9 and Fact 2.10(i) to obtain that

$$1 \geq c_0(C, D) \geq \left\langle \frac{x}{\|x\|}, \frac{x}{\|x\|} \right\rangle = 1,$$

which implies that $c_0(C, D) = 1$.

(iv): By Fact 2.10(iii) and (i) above,

$$c_0(C, D) = c_0(\text{cone}(C), \text{cone}(D)) \geq c_0\left(\left(\text{cone}(C) \cap (C^\oplus + D^\ominus)\right), \left(\text{cone}(D) \cap (C^\oplus + D^\ominus)\right)\right) = c(C, D),$$

which, combining with Fact 2.10(i), deduces the desired results. ■

Remark 2.13. The following examples illustrate that the similar inequality presented in Lemma 2.12(i) for “minimal angle” does not hold for “angle”. Suppose $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2$.

(i) Suppose $C := \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0)$, $D := \mathbb{R}_+(-1, 0)$, $U := \mathbb{R}_x^2$ and $V := \mathbb{R}_x^2$. Then $C \subseteq U$, $D \subseteq V$, $(C \cap D)^\oplus = \mathcal{H}$, $(U \cap V)^\ominus = \mathcal{H}$. Hence, $c(C, D) = c_0(C, D) = 0 = c_0(U, V) = c(U, V)$.

(ii) Suppose $C := \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0)$, $D := \mathbb{R}_+(1, 1)$, and $U = V = \mathcal{H}$. Then $C \subseteq U$, $D \subseteq V$, $(C \cap D)^\oplus = \mathcal{H}$, $(U \cap V)^\ominus = \{0\}$. Hence, $c(C, D) = c_0(C, D) = \sqrt{2}/2 > 0 = c_0(\{0\}, \{0\}) = c(U, V)$.

(iii) Suppose $C := \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0)$, $D := \mathbb{R}_+(-1, 0)$, $U := \mathbb{R}_x^2$ and $V := \{(x_1, x_2) : -x_1 \geq x_2 \geq 0\}$. Then $C \subseteq U$, $D \subseteq V$, $U \cap V = \{0\}$. Hence, $c(C, D) = c_0(C, D) = 0 < \sqrt{2}/2 = \left\langle (0, 1), (-\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}) \right\rangle = c_0(U, V) = c(U, V)$.

Fact 2.14. [6, Propositions 3.3(4)] Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Then $c(K_1, K_2) = c_0(K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus, K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus)$.

Miscellaneous results

The following fact is necessary for the proof of Lemma 2.16 below.

Fact 2.15 (Dunkl-Williams inequality). [9, Page 54] Let $u$ and $v$ be in $\mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \frac{u}{\|u\|} - \frac{v}{\|v\|} \right\| \leq \frac{\|u\| - \|v\|}{\|u\| + \|v\|}. \quad (2.2)$$
In fact, in the following result, \( \gamma = \frac{\beta}{2} \) is motivated by [13, Proposition 4.2] which shows an identity on the maximal angle between two closed convex cones.

**Lemma 2.16.** Let \( C \) and \( D \) be cones in \( \mathcal{H} \) such that \( C \cap \mathcal{S}_H \neq \emptyset \) and \( D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \neq \emptyset \). Set

\[
\alpha := \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \}, \\
\beta := d(C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, D \cap \mathcal{S}_H) = \inf \{ \| x - y \| : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \}, \\
\gamma := \inf \left\{ \frac{\| x - y \|}{\| x \| + \| y \|} : x \in C, y \in D, (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \right\}.
\]

Then \( \alpha = 1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2} = 1 - 2\gamma^2 \).

**Proof.** (i): It is easy to see that

\[
\frac{\beta^2}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \inf \{ \| x - y \|^2 : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \} \\
= \frac{1}{2} \inf \{ 2 - 2\langle x, y \rangle : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \} \\
= 1 + \inf \{ -\langle x, y \rangle : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \} \\
= 1 - \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \} = 1 - \alpha,
\]

which implies that \( \alpha = 1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2} \). Clearly,

\[
\gamma = \inf \left\{ \frac{\| x - y \|}{\| x \| + \| y \|} : x \in C, y \in D, (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \right\} \\
\leq \inf \left\{ \frac{\| x - y \|}{\| x \| + \| y \|} : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \right\} \\
= \inf \left\{ \frac{\| x - y \|}{2} : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \right\} = \frac{\beta}{2}.
\]

On the other hand, let \( x \in C \) and \( y \in D \) such that \( (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \). Because for every \( z \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H \) and \( w \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \), \( \| z - w \| \leq \| z \| + \| w \| = 2 \), we have that \( \beta \leq 2 \). If \( x = 0 \) and \( y \neq 0 \), then \( \frac{\| x - y \|}{\| x \| + \| y \|} = 1 \geq \frac{\beta}{2} \). Similarly, if \( x \neq 0 \) and \( y = 0 \), then \( \frac{\| x - y \|}{\| x \| + \| y \|} = 1 \geq \frac{\beta}{2} \). Assume \( x \neq 0 \) and \( y \neq 0 \). Substitute \( u = x \) and \( v = y \) in Fact 2.15 to see that

\[
\frac{\| x - y \|}{\| x \| + \| y \|} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\| x \|}{\| x \|} - \frac{\| y \|}{\| y \|} \geq \frac{1}{2} \inf \{ \| x - y \| : x \in C \cap \mathcal{S}_H, y \in D \cap \mathcal{S}_H \} = \frac{\beta}{2}.
\]

Combine these results to see that \( \gamma \geq \frac{\beta}{2} \). Hence, we obtain that \( \gamma = \frac{\beta}{2} \).

Altogether, we obtain that \( \alpha = 1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2} = 1 - 2\gamma^2 \).

\( \blacksquare \)

### 3 Principal vectors of convex sets

In this section, we shall provide equivalent expressions of the cosine of the minimal angle of two convex sets. Moreover, we shall also construct necessary conditions for one pair of vectors in \( \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \) to be a pair of principal vectors defined in Definition 3.3.

The following result was used in [4] and mentioned in [13]. Because we shall use this result multiple times later, we include a proof.
Fact 3.1. Let $C$ and $D$ be two nonempty convex sets of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $C \neq \{0\}$ and $D \neq \{0\}$. Then

$$c_0(C, D) = \max \{0, \sup \{\langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}\}\}.$$ 

Proof. Denote by $\alpha := \max \{0, \sup \{\langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}\}\}$. Because $C \neq \{0\}$ and $D \neq \{0\}$, we know that $\overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \neq \emptyset$ and $\overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, by Fact 2.10(i), $c_0(C, D) \geq 0$ and $S_{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$, it is clear, by Definition 2.9, that $\alpha \leq c_0(C, D)$.

On the other hand, let $u \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $v \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{H}}$. If $\langle u, v \rangle \leq 0$, then $\langle u, v \rangle \leq 0 \leq \alpha$. Assume that $\langle u, v \rangle > 0$. Then clearly, $u \neq 0$ and $v \neq 0$. By Fact 2.1, $\frac{u}{\|u\|} \in (\overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}})$ and $\frac{v}{\|v\|} \in (\overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}})$. Hence,

$$\langle u, v \rangle = \|u\| \|v\| \left(\frac{u}{\|u\|}, \frac{v}{\|v\|}\right) \leq \|u\| \|v\| \sup \{\langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}\} \leq \alpha.$$ 

Therefore, by Definition 2.9, $c_0(C, D) \leq \alpha$. Altogether, $c_0(C, D) = \alpha$.

According to Fact 3.1, the minimal angle studied in [4] and in this work is different from the “minimal angle” considered in [13], but when both of the angles are in $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$, they are consistent.

In the following result, we provide equivalent expressions for the cosine of minimal angle between two closed convex sets.

Theorem 3.2. Let $C$ and $D$ be nonempty convex subsets of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $C \neq \{0\}$ and $D \neq \{0\}$. Set

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha := \sup \{\langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}\}, \\
\beta := d(\overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}) = \inf \{\|x - y\| : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}\}, \\
\gamma := \inf \left\{\frac{\|x - y\|}{\|x\| + \|y\|} : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C), y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D), (x, y) \neq (0, 0)\right\}. 
\end{align*}$$

Then the following statements hold:

(i) $c_0(C, D) = \sup \left\{\sqrt{\langle P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x, P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)} P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x\rangle} : x \in S_{\mathcal{H}}\right\}$.

(ii) Assume that $c_0(C, D) \neq 0$. Then

$$c_0(C, D) = \alpha = 1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2} = 1 - 2\gamma^2.$$ 

Proof. (i): Note that by Fact 2.8,

$$\langle P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x - P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)} P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x, P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)} P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x\rangle = 0. \quad (3.1)$$ 

Moreover, by [6, Proposition 2.2(2), Theorem 2.5] and [5, Theorem 5.6(7)], we know that

$$c_0(C, D) = \sup \{\|P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)} P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x\| : x \in S_{\mathcal{H}}\} = \sup \{\sqrt{\langle P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)} P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x, P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)} P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x\rangle} : x \in S_{\mathcal{H}}\} = \sup \{\sqrt{\langle P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x, P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)} P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)} x\rangle} : x \in S_{\mathcal{H}}\}. \quad (3.1)$$

(ii): Because $c_0(C, D) \neq 0$, by Fact 3.1, it is clear that

$$c_0(C, D) = \sup \{\langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}\}.$$ 

Moreover, $C$ and $D$ are nonempty, $C \neq \{0\}$ and $D \neq \{0\}$ imply that $\overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \neq \emptyset$ and $\overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, apply Lemma 2.16 with $C$ and $D$ replaced by $\overline{\text{cone}}(C)$ and $\overline{\text{cone}}(D)$ respectively to see that (ii) is true. \qed
**Definition 3.3.** [12, Page 1] Let $C$ and $D$ be nonempty convex subsets of $\mathcal{H}$. Let $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$. We say that $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$ is a pair of principal vectors of $C$ and $D$, if $\bar{x} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \overline{B}_H$, $\bar{y} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \overline{B}_H$, and

$$
\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle = c_0(C, D) = \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \overline{B}_H, \ y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \overline{B}_H \}.
$$

The following result provides a sufficient condition for the existence of pairs of principal vectors of two nonempty convex subsets of Hilbert spaces. In particular, the pair of principal vectors of two nonempty convex subsets always exists in finite-dimensional space.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $K$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Let $C$ and $D$ be nonempty convex subsets of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $C \neq \{0\}$ and $D \neq \{0\}$. Suppose that $C \subseteq K$ or $D \subseteq K$. Then there exists $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ such that $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$ is a pair of principal vectors of $C$ and $D$.

**Proof.** By Fact 2.10(i), we have exactly the following two cases:

Case 1: $c_0(C, D) = 0$. Then it is clear that $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle = (0,0)$ works for this special case.

Case 2: $c_0(C, D) > 0$. Then by Fact 3.1,

$$
c_0(C, D) = \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_H, \ y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_H \}.
$$

Hence, there exist sequences $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_H$ and $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_H$ such that $\langle x_k, y_k \rangle \to c_0(C, D)$. Now, because $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are in $S_H$, and $\overline{\text{cone}}(C)$ and $\overline{\text{cone}}(D)$ are nonempty closed and convex, by [2, Lemma 2.45 and Corollary 3.35] and by passing to a subsequence if necessary, there exist $\bar{x} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C)$ and $\bar{y} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D)$ such that $x_k \to \bar{x}$ and $y_k \to \bar{y}$. By [2, Lemma 2.42], we have that

$$
\| \bar{x} \| \leq \lim \inf_{k \to \infty} \| x_k \| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \| \bar{y} \| \leq \lim \inf_{k \to \infty} \| y_k \| = 1,
$$

which implies that $\bar{x} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \overline{B}_H$ and $\bar{y} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \overline{B}_H$.

Moreover, by assumption, without loss of generality, $\overline{\text{cone}}(C) \subseteq K$. Then $x_k \to \bar{x}$ in $K$ and so, by [2, Lemma 2.51(ii)], $x_k \to \bar{x}$. Hence, by [2, Lemma 2.51(iii)], $x_k \to \bar{x}$ and $y_k \to \bar{y}$ imply that

$$
\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle = \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle x_k, y_k \rangle = c_0(K_1, K_2).
$$

Altogether, the proof is complete.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let $C$ and $D$ be nonempty convex subsets of $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$ is a pair of principal vectors of $C$ and $D$ and that $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \neq 0$. Then $\| \bar{x} \| = 1$ and $\| \bar{y} \| = 1$.

Consequently, $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle = \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_H, \ y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_H \}$.

**Proof.** Because $\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \neq 0$ and $0 \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \overline{B}_H$, we know that

$$
\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle > 0,
$$

which implies that $\bar{x} \neq 0$ and $\bar{y} \neq 0$. Suppose to the contrary that $\| \bar{x} \| \neq 1$ or $\| \bar{y} \| \neq 1$. Then by $\bar{x} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \overline{B}_H$ and $\bar{y} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \overline{B}_H$, we have that $1 < \frac{1}{\| \bar{x} \| \| \bar{y} \|}$ and that

$$
\frac{\bar{x}}{\| \bar{x} \|} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \overline{B}_H \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\bar{y}}{\| \bar{y} \|} \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \overline{B}_H.
$$

In addition,

$$
\left\langle \frac{\bar{x}}{\| \bar{x} \|}, \frac{\bar{y}}{\| \bar{y} \|} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{\| \bar{x} \| \| \bar{y} \|} \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \overset{(3.2)}{=} \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle = \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap \overline{B}_H, \ y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap \overline{B}_H \},
$$

which contradicts with (3.3). Therefore, $\| \bar{x} \| = 1$ and $\| \bar{y} \| = 1$. □
The idea of the following proof in case 2 is from that of [13, Proposition 1.3] which shows the necessary condition for the optimal solution of the maximal angle problems defined in [13, Definition 1.1].

**Lemma 3.6.** Let C and D be nonempty convex subsets of $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is a pair of principal vectors of C and D. Then

$$g - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{x} \in C^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{x} - \langle \bar{y}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{y} \in D^\circ.$$ 

**Proof.** By Definition 3.3 and Fact 2.10(i), $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = c_0(C, D) \in [0, 1]$. Hence, we have exactly the following two cases:

**Case 1:** $c_0(C, D) = 0$. Then by Fact 2.10(iii), $c_0(\text{cone}(C), \text{cone}(D)) = c_0(C, D) = 0$. Hence, by [6, Theorems 5.8] and Fact 2.3(ii),

$$g - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{x} = g \in \text{cone}(D) \subseteq (\text{cone}(C))^\circ = C^\circ,$$

$$\bar{x} - \langle \bar{y}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{y} = \bar{x} \in \text{cone}(C) \subseteq (\text{cone}(D))^\circ = D^\circ.$$

**Case 2:** $c_0(C, D) > 0$. Then by Lemma 3.5, $\bar{x} \in \text{cone}(C) \cap S_H, \bar{y} \in \text{cone}(D) \cap S_H$, and

$$\langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle = \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in \text{cone}(C) \cap S_H, y \in \text{cone}(D) \cap S_H \}$$ 

which implies that

$$(\forall x \in \text{cone}(C) \cap S_H) \quad \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \geq \langle x, y \rangle. \quad (3.4)$$

Let $x \in \text{cone}(C) \setminus \{0\}$. Set $\varepsilon_x := \frac{\|x\|}{\|x\|}$. Note that

$$(\forall t \in [0, \varepsilon_x]) \quad \|x + tx\| \geq \|x\| - t\|x\| > 0.$$ 

Hence, the function $f : [0, \varepsilon_x] \to \mathbb{R} : t \mapsto \left(\frac{x + tx}{\|x + tx\|}, \bar{y}\right)$ is well-defined. Because $(\forall t \in [0, \varepsilon_x]) \quad f(t) = \frac{\langle x, y \rangle + t \langle x, \bar{y} \rangle}{\|x + tx\|}$, by [2, Example 2.65],

$$(\forall t \in [0, \varepsilon_x]) \quad f'_{+}(t) = \frac{1}{\|x + tx\|^2} \left(\langle x, \bar{y} \rangle \|x + tx\| - (\langle x, \bar{y} \rangle + t \langle x, \bar{y} \rangle)\langle \frac{x + tx}{\|x + tx\|}, x \rangle\right). \quad (3.5)$$

Because $\{\bar{x}, x\} \subseteq \text{cone}(C)$ and $\text{cone}(C)$ is a closed convex cone, by Lemma 2.2(i), $(\forall t \in [0, \varepsilon_x]) \quad \frac{x + tx}{\|x + tx\|} \in \text{cone}(C) + \text{cone}(C) = \text{cone}(C)$. Hence, by (3.4), $f(0) = \max \{f(t) : t \in [0, \varepsilon_x]\}$. Combine this with (3.5) to see that

$$0 \geq f'_{+}(0) = \langle x, \bar{y} \rangle - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \langle \bar{x}, x \rangle = \left(\bar{y} - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{x}, x \right).$$

Therefore, $(\forall x \in \text{cone}(C)) \quad \langle g - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{x}, x \rangle \leq 0$, that is, $g - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{x} \in (\text{cone}(C))^\circ = C^\circ$.

By similar argument, we get $\bar{x} - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle \bar{y} \in (\text{cone}(D))^\circ = D^\circ$. Altogether, the proof is complete. ■

[13, Theorem 2.3] considers points on the boundary of closed convex cones relative to a linear subspace. The idea of the following proof is from [13, Theorem 2.3].

**Lemma 3.7.** Let C and D be nonempty subsets of $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $x \in S_H, y \in S_H, y = \langle x, y \rangle x \in C^\circ$, and $x = \langle x, y \rangle y \in D^\circ$, and that $|\langle x, y \rangle| \neq 1$. Then

$$x + \text{cone}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) \subseteq C^\circ, \quad x \notin \text{int} C, \quad y + \text{cone}(x - \langle x, y \rangle y) \subseteq D^\circ, \quad \text{and} \quad y \notin \text{int} D.$$
Fact 2.3(i) to obtain that
\[(3.6)\]
Fact 2.7 and where the last equivalence is from Proof.

Note that by \[\langle x, y - \langle x, y \rangle x \rangle \] which is a contradiction. So, we know that
\[\langle x, y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle x \] and \[\langle x, y \rangle \] is arbitrary, we know that \[x + \alpha(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) \subseteq C^c\] and that \(x \not\in \text{int } C\).

By analogous arguments, we get \(y + \alpha(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) \subseteq D^c\) and \(y \not\in \text{int } D\) as well. \(\blacksquare\)

Lemma 3.8. Let \(C\) be a nonempty convex subset of \(H\). Let \((x, y) \in H \times H\). Assume that \(x \in S_H\). Then the following equivalences are true:

(i) \(y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in C^\circ \iff y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in \text{cone } C\).

(ii) \(x = P_C(x + \text{cone } (y - \langle x, y \rangle x)) \iff [x \in C \text{ and } y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in C^\circ]\).

(iii) \((\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) \lambda (y - \langle x, y \rangle x) = P_C(\alpha(x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x)) \iff [x \in \text{cone } C \text{ and } y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in C^\circ]\).

Proof. Because \(x \in S_H\), we have
\[(3.7)\]

(i): By the definition of polar cone,
\[y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in C^\circ \iff (\forall z \in C) \left(\langle y - \langle x, y \rangle x, z \rangle \leq 0\right)\]
\[\iff (\forall z \in C) \left(\langle y - \langle x, y \rangle x, z - x \rangle \leq 0\right)\]
\[\iff y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in \text{cone } C\] (by Fact 2.7)

(ii): Because, by [2, Proposition 6.2(i)], \(\text{cone } (y - \langle x, y \rangle x) = \mathbb{R}_{++}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x)\), we have that
\[x = P_C(x + \text{cone } (y - \langle x, y \rangle x))\]
\[\iff (\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) x = P_C(x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x))\]
\[\iff [x \in C \text{ and } (\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++})(\forall z \in C) \left(\langle x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x), z - x \rangle \leq 0\right) \iff [x \in C \text{ and } y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in \text{cone } C\] (by \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\))
\[\iff [x \in C \text{ and } y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in \text{cone } C\] (by \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\))

(iii): Let \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\). Using Fact 2.7 and Fact 2.3(i), we have that
\[\lambda (y - \langle x, y \rangle x) = P_C(\alpha(x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x))\]
\[\iff y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in C^\circ\] and \(\forall z \in C^\circ\) \(\left(\langle x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) - \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x), z - (y - \langle x, y \rangle x) \leq 0\right)\]
\[\iff y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in C^\circ\] and \(\forall z \in C^\circ\) \(\left(\langle x, z - (y - \langle x, y \rangle x) \right) \leq 0\)
\[\iff y - (x, y) x \in C^\circ\] and \(x \in C^\circ\)
\[\iff y - (x, y) x \in C^\circ\] and \(x \in \text{cone } C\),
where the last equivalence is from Fact 2.3(iii). \(\blacksquare\)
The following result provides necessary conditions for \((x, y) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}\) to be a pair of principal vectors of two nonempty closed convex subsets \(C\) and \(D\) in \(\mathcal{H}\) with \(C \neq \{0\}\) and \(D \neq \{0\}\).

**Proposition 3.9.** Let \(C\) and \(D\) be nonempty convex subsets of \(\mathcal{H}\) with \(C \neq \{0\}\) and \(D \neq \{0\}\). Assume that \((x, y)\) is a pair of principal vectors of \(C\) and \(D\). Let \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}\). Then the following statements hold:

(i) If \(x \neq 0, y \neq 0\) and \(|(x, y)| \neq 1\), then

\[
x + \text{cone}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) \subseteq (\text{cone}(C))^\circ, \quad x \notin \text{int cone}(C),
\]

\[
y + \text{cone}(x - \langle x, y \rangle y) \subseteq (\text{cone}(D))^\circ, \quad y \notin \text{int cone}(D).
\]

(ii) \(x = P_{\text{cone}(C)}(x + \text{cone}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x)), \quad y = P_{\text{cone}(D)}(y + \text{cone}(x - \langle x, y \rangle y)).\)

(iii) \(\lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) = P_{C^\circ}(x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x)), \quad \lambda(x - \langle x, y \rangle y) = P_{D^\circ}(y + \lambda(x - \langle x, y \rangle y)).\)

**Proof.** By Definition 3.3 and Fact 2.10(i), \((x, y) = c_0(C, D) \in [0, 1]\). Hence, we have exactly the following two cases:

*Case 1:* \((x, y) = 0\). By Definition 3.3, Lemma 3.6 and Fact 2.3(ii), \(x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap D^\circ = \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap (\text{cone}(D))^\circ\) and \(y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap C^\circ = \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap (\text{cone}(C))^\circ\).

For the proof of (i), because \((x, y) = 0\) and \(y \neq 0\), we have that

\[
(\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) \quad \langle x + \alpha(y - \langle x, y \rangle x), y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle + \alpha \langle y, y \rangle = \alpha \|y\|^2 > 0,
\]

which, combining with \(y \in (\overline{\text{cone}}(C))^\circ\), implies that \(x + \text{cone}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) = x + \mathbb{R}_{++}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) \subseteq (\overline{\text{cone}}(C))^\circ\) and that \(x \notin \text{int cone}(C).\)

Consider the proof of (ii)&(iii). Because \(y \in (\overline{\text{cone}}(C))^\circ = C^\circ\) and \(x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C)\), we have that

\[
(\forall z \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C)) \quad \langle x + \lambda y - x, z - x \rangle = \lambda \langle y, z - x \rangle = \lambda \langle y, z \rangle \leq 0, \tag{3.8a}
\]

\[
(\forall w \in C^\circ) \quad \langle x + \lambda y - \lambda y, w - \lambda y \rangle = \langle x, w - \lambda y \rangle = \langle x, w \rangle \leq 0. \tag{3.8b}
\]

Moreover, by (3.8a), \((x, y) = 0\) and Fact 2.7, we see that \(x = P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)}(x + \text{cone}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x)).\) In addition, by (3.8b) and Fact 2.7, we obtain that \(\lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) = P_{C^\circ}(x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x)).\)

By similar argument, we get the remaining parts of (i), (ii) and (iii).

*Case 2:* \((x, y) > 0\). Then by Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 and Fact 2.3(ii), we have that \(x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_H, \quad y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_H, \quad y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in (\overline{\text{cone}}(C))^\circ, \quad x - \langle x, y \rangle y \in D^\circ = (\overline{\text{cone}}(D))^\circ.\)

Now, apply Lemma 3.7 with \(C = \overline{\text{cone}}(C)\) and \(D = \overline{\text{cone}}(D)\) to obtain the desired results in (i).

Because \(x \in \overline{\text{cone}}(C) \cap S_H\) and \(y - \langle x, y \rangle x \in (\overline{\text{cone}}(C))^\circ\), apply Lemma 3.8(ii)&(iii) with \(C = \overline{\text{cone}}(C)\) to see that \(x = P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(C)}(x + \text{cone}(y - \langle x, y \rangle x))\) and \(\lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x) = P_{C^\circ}(x + \lambda(y - \langle x, y \rangle x)).\)

Similarly, using \(y \in \overline{\text{cone}}(D) \cap S_H\) and \(x - \langle x, y \rangle y \in (\overline{\text{cone}}(D))^\circ\), and applying Lemma 3.8(ii)&(iii) with \(C = \overline{\text{cone}}(D)\) and with switching \(x\) and \(y\) to obtain that \(y = P_{\overline{\text{cone}}(D)}(y + \text{cone}(x - \langle x, y \rangle y))\) and \(\lambda(x - \langle x, y \rangle y) = P_{D^\circ}(y + \lambda(x - \langle x, y \rangle y)).\)

Therefore, (ii) and (iii) hold in this case as well.

\[\blacksquare\]

### 4 Angles between closed convex cones

In this section, we characterize the positivity of the minimal angle between two closed convex cones and we study the closedness of the sum of the two cones.
Positive angles between two cones

Lemma 4.1. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following hold:

(i) If $K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \{0\}$, then $c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$.

(ii) If $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$, then $c_0(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1, K_2)$.

(iii) $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ if and only if $K_1^\ominus + K_2^\ominus = \mathcal{H}$.

Proof. (i)&(ii): These follow from Lemma 2.12(iii) and Fact 2.14, respectively.

(iii): By Fact 2.4, $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\} \iff (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus = \{0\}^\ominus = \mathcal{H} \iff K_1^\ominus + K_2^\ominus = \mathcal{H}$. ■

Corollary 4.2. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following hold:

(i) Assume that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$. Then $c(K_1, K_2) < 1 \iff c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1 \iff K_1^\ominus + K_2^\ominus$ is closed.

(ii) Assume that $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$. Then $K_1^\ominus + K_2^\ominus$ is closed.

Proof. (i): Because $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ is equivalent to $(K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus = \mathcal{H}$, the desired equivalences follow directly from [6, Theorem 2.5] and [7, Corollary 4.10].

(ii): Because $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$, by the Lemma 4.1(i), implies $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$, this is from (i) above. ■

According Example 6.4 below, we know that under the assumption of Corollary 4.2, the converse statement of Corollary 4.2(ii) doesn’t hold even if one of the cones is a linear subspace.

The following results imply that in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the sufficient conditions in Lemma 4.1 (i)&(ii) are also necessary conditions.

Proposition 4.3. Let $K$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose that $K_1 \subseteq K$ or $K_2 \subseteq K$. Then the following hold:

(i) $K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \{0\}$ if and only if $c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$.

(ii) $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ if and only if $c_0(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1, K_2)$.

(iii) $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ if and only if $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$.

Proof. (i): Assume $c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$. Then $K_1 \neq \{0\}$ and $K_2 \neq \{0\}$ and so by Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 3.5, there exist $\tilde{x} \in K_1 \cap S_\mathcal{H}$ and $\tilde{y} \in K_2 \cap S_\mathcal{H}$ such that $\langle \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \rangle = c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$. Hence, $\tilde{x} \neq 0$, $\tilde{y} \neq 0$ and

$$
\|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}\|^2 = \|\tilde{x}\|^2 - 2\langle \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \rangle + \|\tilde{y}\|^2 \leq 1 - 2 + 1 = 0,
$$

which implies that $\tilde{x} = \tilde{y} \in K_1 \cap K_2 \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore, $K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \{0\}$.

Moreover, the reverse direction holds by Lemma 4.1(i). Hence, (i) holds.

(ii): Suppose that $c_0(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1, K_2)$. Assume to the contrary that $K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \{0\}$. Then by (i) above, $c(K_1, K_2) = c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$, which, by Fact 2.14, implies that

$$
1 = c(K_1, K_2) = c_0 \left( K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus, K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus \right).
$$

Note that by Fact 2.3(i), $K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus$ and $K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus$ are nonempty closed convex cones. Apply (i) above with $K_1 = K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus$ and $K_2 = K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus$ to obtain that

$$
\{0\} = (K_1 \cap K_2) \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus = (K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus) \cap (K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\ominus) \neq \{0\},
$$

which is absurd. Hence, $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$. In addition, the converse direction holds by Lemma 4.1(ii).

(iii): Note that by Fact 2.10(i), $c_0(K_1, K_2) \neq 1 \iff c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$. So, the desired result is from (i). ■
The following result implies that the cosine of the angle between two closed convex cones is always strictly less than 1 in a finite-dimensional space.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let $K$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones of $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose that $K_1 \subseteq K$ or $K_2 \subseteq K$. Then

$$c(K_1, K_2) < 1.$$  

**Proof.** If $K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \{0\}$, then by Proposition 4.3(ii) and Lemma 2.12(iv), we have that $c(K_1, K_2) < c_0(K_1, K_2) \leq 1$.

Assume that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$. Then combine Lemma 2.12(iv) with Proposition 4.3(iii) to see that $c(K_1, K_2) \leq c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$. □

In the following result, we characterize the condition for the cosine of minimal angle between two nonempty closed convex cones is strictly less than 1. In fact, the following equivalence is clear by Theorem 3.2 when $c_0(K_1, K_2) \neq 0$.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $K_1 \neq \{0\}$ and $K_2 \neq \{0\}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:

(i) $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$.

(ii) $\sup \{ \langle P_{K_1} x, P_{K_2} P_{K_1} x \rangle : x \in S_{\mathcal{H}} \} < 1$.

(iii) $d(K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}) > 0$.

(iv) $\inf \left\{ \frac{\|x - y\|}{\|x\| + \|y\|} : x \in K_1, y \in K_2, (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \right\} > 0$.

**Proof.** (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii): This is clear from Theorem 3.2(i).

(i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii): Suppose that $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$. Assume to the contrary that

$$0 = d(K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}) = \inf \{ \|x - y\| : x \in K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \}.$$  

Then there exist sequences $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that

$$0 = \lim_{k \to \infty} \|x_k - y_k\|^2 = \lim_{k \to \infty} (\|x_k\|^2 - 2\langle x_k, y_k \rangle + \|y_k\|^2) = 2 - 2 \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle x_k, y_k \rangle,$$

which implies that $1 = \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle x_k, y_k \rangle$. Combine this with the assumption $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$ and Fact 3.1 to obtain that

$$1 > c_0(K_1, K_2) \geq \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \} \geq \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle x_k, y_k \rangle = 1,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $d(K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}) > 0$.

Assume $d(K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}) > 0$. Assume to the contrary that $c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$. Then by Fact 3.1,

$$1 = \sup \{ \langle x, y \rangle : x \in K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, y \in K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \}.$$  

Hence, there exist sequences $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $1 = \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle x_k, y_k \rangle$.

Therefore,

$$0 < d(K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}})^2 \leq \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_k - y_k\|^2 = 2 + 2 \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (-\langle x_k, y_k \rangle) \leq 2 - 2 \lim_{k \to \infty} \langle x_k, y_k \rangle = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$.

(iii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iv): As we did in Theorem 3.2, denote by $\gamma := \inf \left\{ \frac{\|x - y\|}{\|x\| + \|y\|} : x \in K_1, y \in K_2, (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \right\}$. Because $K_1$ and $K_2$ are nonempty closed convex cones, $K_1 \neq \{0\}$ and $K_2 \neq \{0\}$, we know that $K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \neq \emptyset$ and $K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, by Lemma 2.16, we have $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} d(K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}, K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}})$, which implies the desired equivalence. □
Closedness of sums of cones

Consider the closed convex cone \( K := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq x_3 \} \) and the closed linear subspace \( M := \mathbb{R}(1,0,-1) \). By Example 6.4(ii) below, we know that \( K + M \) is not closed. We provide sufficient conditions for the closedness of the sum of two closed convex cones below. Moreover, in Example 6.4(ii), \( K^\ominus - M^\bot \) is closed but \( c_0(K^\ominus, M^\bot) = 1 \), which implies that the converse statement of Theorem 4.6 is generally not true.

The idea of the proof of Theorem 4.6 is from that of [4, Theorem 2.12(1) ⇒ (2)] which is on linear subspaces.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) be nonempty closed convex cones in \( \mathcal{H} \). Assume that \( c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1 \). Then \( K_1 - K_2 \) is closed.

**Proof.** By Fact 2.10(ii), we know that
\[
(\forall x \in K_1)(\forall y \in K_2) \quad \langle x, y \rangle \leq c_0(K_1, K_2)\|x\|\|y\|. 
\tag{4.1}
\]
Take \( z \in K_1 - K_2 \). Then there exist sequences \((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) in \( K_1 \) and \((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) in \( K_2 \) s.t. \( z = \lim_{k \to \infty} x_k - y_k \). Now,
\[
(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \|x_k - y_k\|^2 = \|x_k\|^2 + \|y_k\|^2 - 2\langle x_k, y_k \rangle \geq (\|x_k\| - \|y_k\|)^2 + 2(1 - c_0(K_1, K_2))\|x_k\|\|y_k\|, 
\tag{4.1}
\]
which, combining with the boundedness of the convergent sequence \((x_k - y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) and the assumption \( c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1 \), yields that the sequences \((\|x_k\| - \|y_k\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) and \((\|x_k\|\|y_k\|)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) are bounded. Note that \( (\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) \quad (\|x_k\| - \|y_k\|)^2 + 2\|x_k\|\|y_k\| = \|x_k\|^2 + \|y_k\|^2 \), so the sequences \((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) and \((y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) are bounded. Because \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are nonempty closed and convex sets, by [2, Lemma 2.45 and Corollary 3.35] and by passing to a subsequence if necessary, there exist \( \bar{x} \in K_1 \) and \( \bar{y} \in K_2 \) such that \( x_k \to \bar{x} \) and \( y_k \to \bar{y} \). Combine this with the result that \( z = \lim_{k \to \infty} x_k - y_k \) to obtain that \( z = \bar{x} - \bar{y} \in K_1 - K_2 \). Hence, \( K_1 - K_2 \subseteq K_1 - K_2 \). Therefore, \( K_1 - K_2 \) is closed. \( \blacksquare \)

**Corollary 4.7.** Let \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) be nonempty closed convex cones in \( \mathcal{H} \). Assume that one of the following items holds:

(i) \( c_0(K_1, -K_2) < 1 \).

(ii) \( \sup \left\{ \langle P_{K_1} x, P_{-K_2} P_{K_1} x \rangle : x \in \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H} \right\} < 1 \).

(iii) \( d(K_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H}, -K_2 \cap \mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H}) > 0 \).

(iv) \( \inf \left\{ \frac{\|x+y\|}{\|x\| + \|y\|} : x \in K_1, y \in K_2, \langle x, y \rangle \neq (0,0) \right\} > 0 \).

(v) Let \( \mathcal{K} \) be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of \( \mathcal{H} \), and suppose that \( K_1 \subseteq \mathcal{K} \) or \( K_2 \subseteq \mathcal{K} \) and that \( K_1 \cap (-K_2) = \{0\} \).

Then \( K_1 + K_2 \) is closed.

**Proof.** If \( K_1 = \{0\} \) or \( K_2 = \{0\} \), then clearly, \( K_1 + K_2 \) is closed. Assume that \( K_1 \neq \{0\} \) or \( K_2 \neq \{0\} \). Note that \( K_2 \) is a closed convex cone if and only if \( -K_2 \) is a closed convex cone. By Theorem 4.5, we know that the conditions (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) are equivalent. Moreover, by Proposition 4.3(iii), the condition (v) implies (i). Combine these results with Theorem 4.6 to complete the proof. \( \blacksquare \)

**Remark 4.8.** Consider Corollary 4.7.

(i) The fact that (iii) implies the closedness of \( K_1 + K_2 \) follows also from [3, Theorem 3.2].
(ii) The result that the conditions (iv) and (v) imply the closedness of $K_1 + K_2$ is the second part of [13, Proposition 4.1] which is in the Euclidean space.

In a word, by using the tool of minimal angle, we deduce the sufficient conditions for the closedness of the sum of two closed convex cones in [3] and [13]. Note that the proof of Corollary 4.7 has nothing to do with the proofs of [3, Theorem 3.2] and [13, Proposition 4.1].

**Intersections of cones**

To prove the main result Theorem 4.10 in this subsection, we need the following easy result.

**Lemma 4.9.** Let $K$ be a convex subset of $H$ and let $u \in H$. Assume that there exist $x \in K$ and $y \in K$ such that $\langle x, u \rangle > 0$ and $\langle y, u \rangle < 0$. Then there exists $t \in ]0, 1[$ such that $tx + (1 - t)y \in K \cap \{u\}$. 

**Proof.** Define $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} : t \mapsto \langle y + t(x - y), u \rangle$. It is clear that $f$ is continuous. Moreover, by the assumptions, we have that $f(0) = \langle y, u \rangle < 0$ and $f(1) = \langle x, u \rangle > 0$. Hence, there exists $t \in ]0, 1[$ such that $\langle tx + (1 - t)y, u \rangle = f(t) = 0$, which combining with the convexity of $K$, implies that $tx + (1 - t)y \in K \cap \{u\}$. □

**Theorem 4.10.** Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $H$. Assume that $K_1$ is not a linear subspace and that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$. Assume that one of the following items hold:

(i) There exists $u \in H$ such that $K_2 = \{u\}$. 

(ii) There exists $u \in H$ such that $H := \{u\}^\perp$ satisfies $K_2 \subseteq H$ and $H \cap K_1 = \{0\}$. 

(iii) Let $K$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $H$. Suppose that $K_1 \subseteq K$ or $K_2 \subseteq K$.

Then

$$K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}.$$

**Proof.** Because, by Lemma 2.5(i), $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ = -(K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ)$, we only need to prove that $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}$.

If $K_2 = \{0\}$, then $K_2^\circ = H$. Because $K_1$ is not a linear subspace implies that $K_1 \not\subseteq H$ and that $K_1^\circ \neq \{0\}$, which implies that $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}$. Hence, in the rest of the proof, we assume that $K_2 \not= \{0\}$.

Assume (i) holds: We separate the proof into the following two steps:

**Step 1:** In this part, we show that

$$\langle \forall x \in K_1, \langle u, x \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \langle \forall x \in K_1, \langle u, x \rangle \geq 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Assume to the contrary that there exists $x_1 \in K_1$ and $x_2 \in K_1$ such that $\langle x_1, u \rangle > 0$ and $\langle x_2, u \rangle < 0$. Then apply Lemma 4.9 with $K = K_1$ to see that there exists $\bar{t} \in ]0, 1[$ such that $\bar{t}x_1 + (1 - \bar{t})x_2 \in K_1 \cap K_2$. If $\bar{t}x_1 + (1 - \bar{t})x_2 \not= 0$, then $\bar{t}x_1 + (1 - \bar{t})x_1 \in (K_1 \cap K_2) \setminus \{0\}$, which contradicts with the assumption that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$. So, we know that (4.2) is true.

Now assume $\bar{t}x_1 + (1 - \bar{t})x_2 = 0$. Then

$$x_1 = -\frac{1 - \bar{t}}{\bar{t}}x_2 \in -K_1,$$

which implies that $x_1 \in K_1 \cap (-K_1)$. Combine this with the assumption that $K_1$ is a closed convex cone to see that $\text{span} \{x_1\} = \mathbb{R} \cdot x_1 \subseteq K_1$.

Because $K_1$ is not a linear subspace, $K_1 \setminus \text{span} \{x_1\} \neq \emptyset$. Take $z \in K_1 \setminus \text{span} \{x_1\}$. Because $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ and $z \neq 0$, we have either $\langle z, u \rangle > 0$ or $\langle z, u \rangle < 0$. 


If \( \langle z, u \rangle > 0 \), then applying Lemma 4.9 with \( K = K_1 \), \( x = z \) and \( y = -x_1 \), we get that there exists \( \ell \in ]0,1[ \) such that \( \ell z - (1 - \ell) x_1 \in K_1 \cap K_2 \). If \( \ell z - (1 - \ell) x_1 = 0 \), then \( z = \frac{1}{1-\ell} x_1 \in \text{span} \{ x_1 \} \), which contradicts with that \( z \in K_1 \cap \text{span} \{ x_1 \} \). Hence, \( \ell z - (1 - \ell) x_1 \in (K_1 \cap K_2) \setminus \{ 0 \} \), which contradicts the assumption that \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{ 0 \} \). Hence, (4.2) is true in this case.

If \( \langle z, u \rangle < 0 \), then applying Lemma 4.9 with \( K = K_1 \), \( x = x_1 \) and \( y = z \), we get that there exists \( \ell \in ]0,1[ \) such that \( \ell x_1 - (1 - \ell) z \in K_1 \cap K_2 \). Similarly with the proof above, \( \ell x_1 - (1 - \ell) z = 0 \) implies that \( z = -\frac{1}{1-\ell} x_1 \in \text{span} \{ x_1 \} \), which contradicts with that \( z \in K_1 \cap \text{span} \{ x_1 \} \). Hence, \( \ell x_1 - (1 - \ell) z \in (K_1 \cap K_2) \setminus \{ 0 \} \), which contradicts with the assumption that \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{ 0 \} \). Hence, in this case (4.2) holds as well.

 Altogether, in all cases, (4.2) holds.

**Step 2:** Note that if \( u = 0 \), then using the assumption, \( K_1 \) is not a linear subspace, we have that \( K_1 \cap K_2 = K_1 \neq \{ 0 \} \), which contradicts with the assumption \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{ 0 \} \). Hence, \( u \neq 0 \). Moreover, because \( K_2 = \{ u \}^\perp \), by Lemma 2.5(iii), \( K_2^\perp = K_2^\perp = \text{span} \{ u \} \). Therefore, by (4.2), we have exactly the following two cases:

*Case 1:* \( \forall x \in K_1 \) \( \langle u, x \rangle \leq 0 \). Then \( u \in (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) \setminus \{ 0 \} \).

*Case 2:* \( \forall x \in K_1 \) \( \langle u, x \rangle \geq 0 \). Then \( -u \in (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) \setminus \{ 0 \} \).

 Altogether, \( K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp \neq \{ 0 \} \).

Assume (ii) holds: Because \( K_2 \subseteq H \) implies that \( H^\perp = H^\oplus \subseteq K_2^\oplus \), apply (i) with \( K_2 = H \) to obtain that

\[
\{ 0 \} \neq K_1^\perp \cap H^\perp \subseteq K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\oplus,
\]

which implies that \( K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\oplus \neq \{ 0 \} \).

Assume (iii) holds: Assume to the contrary that \( K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\oplus = \{ 0 \} \). Then by Lemma 4.1(iii), Fact 2.3(iv) and Lemma 2.5(i), we know that

\[
H = K_1^\perp + K_2^\perp = K_1 - K_2.
\]  

(4.3)

Because \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{ 0 \} \), by Proposition 4.3(iii) and Theorem 4.6, we have that

\[
K_1 \cap K_2 = \{ 0 \} \iff c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1 \Rightarrow K_1 - K_2 = K_1 - K_2,
\]

which, combining with (4.3), implies that

\[
H = K_1 - K_2.
\]  

(4.4)

Because \( K_1 \) is a nonempty convex cone but not a linear subspace, by Lemma 2.2(ii), \( -K_1 \not\subseteq K_1 \). Hence, there exists \( \bar{y} \in K_1 \) such that \( -\bar{y} \notin K_1 \). Take \( \bar{x} \in K_2 \setminus \{ 0 \} \). Then

\[
\bar{x} - \bar{y} \in H \quad \text{(4.4)} \quad K_1 - K_2,
\]

which implies that there exist \( \bar{y} \in K_1 \) and \( \bar{x} \in K_2 \) such that

\[
\bar{x} - \bar{y} = \bar{y} - \bar{x} \quad \text{(4.5)}
\]

Because \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are nonempty closed convex cones, by Lemma 2.2(i), \( K_1 + K_1 = K_1 \) and \( K_2 + K_2 = K_2 \). Hence, \( \bar{x} + \bar{x} = \bar{y} + \bar{y} \in K_2 \cap K_1 \). If \( \bar{x} + \bar{x} = 0 \), then by (4.5), \( -\bar{y} = \bar{y} - (\bar{x} + \bar{x}) = \bar{y} \in K_1 \), which contradicts with \( -\bar{y} \notin K_1 \). Hence, \( \bar{x} + \bar{x} \in (K_1 \cap K_2) \setminus \{ 0 \} \), which contradicts the assumption that \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{ 0 \} \). Therefore, under the condition (iii), we have also that \( K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\oplus \neq \{ 0 \} \). \( \blacksquare \)
Remark 4.11. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathbb{R}^2$. According to Example 6.1(ii), even if both $K_1$ and $K_2$ are not linear subspaces, $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ and $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ = \{0\}$ occur simultaneously. Because $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ = -(K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ)$, we know that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ and $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ = \{0\}$ occur together in Example 6.1 as well. Therefore, we conclude that in Theorem 4.10, $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}$ can not be replaced by $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}$ or $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}$.

As an application of Theorem 4.10, in the following Corollary 4.12, we show that under the assumptions of Theorem 4.10, $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$ and $c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) < 1$ cannot occur together. Hence, under the assumptions of Corollary 4.12, $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$ implies that $c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = 1 > c_0(K_1, K_2)$, which reduces to [4, Lemma 2.14] when $M$ and $N$ are cones and $X = \mathcal{H}$.

Corollary 4.12. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose that $K_1$ is not a linear subspace. Assume that one of the following items hold:

(i) There exists $u \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $K_2 = \{u\}^\perp$.

(ii) There exists $u \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $K_2 \subseteq H := \{u\}^\perp$ and that $H \cap K_1 = \{0\}$.

(iii) Let $K$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose that $K_1 \subseteq K$ or $K_2 \subseteq K$.

Then if $K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \{0\}$, then $c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$; if $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$, then $c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = 1$ and $c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = 1$. Consequently,

$$c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1 \text{ or } [c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = 1 \text{ and } c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = 1].$$

Proof. If $K_1 \cap K_2 \neq \{0\}$, then by Lemma 4.1(i), $c_0(K_1, K_2) = 1$.

Assume $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$. By the assumptions and Theorem 4.10, we know that $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}$ and $K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ \neq \{0\}$. Combine this with Lemma 4.1(i), we obtain $c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = 1$ and $c_0(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = 1$. □

5 Angle identities for cones

In this section, we show identities on cosine of angles between nonempty closed convex cones. Let’s first see an easy one.

Proposition 5.1. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose that $K_1 \subseteq K_2$. Then $c(K_1, K_2) = 0 = c(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ)$.

Proof. Because $K_1 \subseteq K_2$, then $K_1 \cap K_2 = K_1$, $(K_1 \cap K_2)^\circ = K_1^\circ$. Moreover, because $K_1$ is a nonempty closed cone implies that $0 \in K_1$ by Lemma 2.2(i), we have that

$$K_2 = \{0\} + K_2 \subseteq K_1 + K_2 \subseteq K_2 + K_2 = K_2,$$

which implies that $K_1 + K_2 = K_2$. Combine this with Fact 2.4 and Fact 2.3(iv) to see that

$$(K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ)^\circ = (K_1 \cap K_2)^\circ \cap K_2^\circ = K_1^\circ + K_2^\circ = K_2^\circ = K_2.$$

Moreover, using Fact 2.14 and Definition 2.9, we obtain that

$$c(K_1, K_2) = c_0(K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\circ, K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\circ) = c_0(K_1 \cap K_1^\circ, K_2 \cap K_1^\circ) = c_0(\{0\}, K_2 \cap K_1^\circ) = 0,$$

$$c(K_1^\circ, K_2^\circ) = c_0(K_1^\circ \cap (K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ)^\circ, K_2^\circ \cap (K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ)^\circ) = c_0(K_1^\circ \cap K_2^\circ, \{0\}) = 0.$$ □

As a generalization of [4, Lemma 2.14], the following result provides an upper bound for the cosine of two cones. When $K_2$ is a linear subspace, then $-K_2 = K_2$ and $K_2^\perp = -K_2^\perp = -K_2^\perp = K_2^\perp$ and so, in this case, Proposition 5.2 reduces to [4, Lemma 2.14].
Proposition 5.2. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$ and that $X$ is a convex subset of $\mathcal{H}$ which contains $K_1 - K_2$. Then

$$c_0(K_1, K_2) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor \cap X, K_2^\lor \cap X) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.12(i), we know that

$$c_0(K_1^\lor \cap (1 - K_2), K_2^\lor \cap (1 - K_2)) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor \cap X, K_2^\lor \cap X) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor).$$

Hence, it suffices to prove that $c_0(K_1, K_2) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor \cap (1 - K_2), K_2^\lor \cap (1 - K_2))$.

If $c_0(K_1, K_2) = 0$, then $c_0(K_1, K_2) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor \cap (1 - K_2), K_2^\lor \cap (1 - K_2))$.

Now assume that $c_0(K_1, K_2) \in (0, 1]$. Then by Fact 3.1, there exist sequences $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $K_1 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $(y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $K_2 \cap S_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $(x_k, y_k) \rightarrow c_0(K_1, K_2)$.

Note that, by the definition of dual cone, $K_1^\lor = -K_1^\ominus$. Moreover, by Fact 2.8, $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) x_k - P_{K_1} x_k \in K_1^\ominus \cap (1 - K_2)$ and $P_{K_2} x_k - P_{K_2} x_k \in K_1^\ominus \cap (1 - K_2)$. Set $c_0 := c_0(K_1, K_2)$ and $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}) a_k = \|P_{K_2} x_k\|$. Hence, using Lemma 2.12(i), Fact 2.8, and the same techniques shown in [4, Lemma 2.14], we obtain that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$c_0(K_1^\lor \cap (1 - K_2), K_2^\lor \cap (1 - K_2)) \geq \frac{\langle P_{K_2} x_k - P_{K_2} x_k, x_k - P_{K_2} x_k \rangle}{\|P_{K_2} x_k - P_{K_2} x_k\| \|x_k - P_{K_2} x_k\|} \geq a_k - \sqrt{\frac{c_0^2 - a_k^2}{1 - c_0^2}} \rightarrow c_0,$$

which imply that the required result, $c_0(K_1, K_2) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor \cap (1 - K_2), K_2^\lor \cap (1 - K_2))$. $\blacksquare$

In fact, the following result is a generalization of [4, Theorem 2.15] from linear subspaces to cones. As the Example 6.1(iv) below illustrates, the assumption, $\mathcal{H} = K_1 - K_2$, in the following Theorem 5.3 is critical.

Theorem 5.3. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose that $K_1$ or $K_2$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ and that $K_1^\lor$ or $K_2^\lor$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ and that $\mathcal{H} = K_1 - K_2$. Then

$$c_0(K_1, K_2) = c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor) = c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.5(i) and Lemma 2.12(ii), we know that $c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor) = c_0(-K_1^\lor, -K_2^\lor) = c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor)$. Hence, we only need to prove that $c_0(K_1, K_2) = c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor)$.

Because $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ and $K_1$ or $K_2$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, by Fact 2.10(iii) and Proposition 4.3(iii), we know that

$$c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1.$$

Applying Proposition 5.2 with $X = \mathcal{H}$, we obtain

$$c_0(K_1, K_2) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor). \quad (5.1)$$

Note that by $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$ and Theorem 4.6, we have that $K_1 - K_2$ is closed. Combine this with Lemma 4.1(iii), Fact 2.3(iv) and Lemma 2.5(i) to obtain that

$$\mathcal{H} = K_1 - K_2 \iff K_1^\ominus \cap (-K_2^\ominus) = \{0\} \iff K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus = \{0\} \iff K_1^\lor \cap K_2^\lor = -(K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus) = \{0\}.$$

Combine this with the assumption, $K_1^\lor$ or $K_2^\lor$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, and Fact 2.10(iii) and Proposition 4.3(iii) to see that

$$c_0(K_2^\lor, K_1^\lor) < 1.$$

Similarly, applying Proposition 5.2 with $(K_1, K_2)$ replaced by $(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor)$ and $X = \mathcal{H}$, and using Fact 2.3(iv) and Lemma 2.5(ii), we obtain that

$$c_0(K_1^\lor, K_2^\lor) \leq c_0(K_1^\lor \cap K_2^\lor, K_1^\lor \cap K_2^\lor) = c_0(K_1, K_2). \quad (5.2)$$

Combine (5.1) and (5.2) to obtain the desired identity. $\blacksquare$
The idea of the following proof is from that of [4, Theorem 2.16].

**Theorem 5.4.** Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $c(K_1, K_2) < 1$, that $K_1 \cap K_2$ and $K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus$ are linear subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$, and that $K_1^\perp + (K_1 \cap K_2) \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_1^\perp$ and $K_2^\perp + (K_1 \cap K_2) \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_2^\perp$. Then

$$c(K_1, K_2) \leq c(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus).$$

Assume additionally that $c(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) < 1$, and that

$$K + (K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus) \cap (K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus)^\perp = K_1 \quad \text{and} \quad K + (K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus) \cap (K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus)^\perp = K_2.$$

Then

$$c(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus).$$

**Proof.** Set $X := (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp \cap (K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus)^\perp$. Because $c(K_1, K_2) < 1$, by Fact 2.14 and Fact 2.3(i),

$$c_0 \left( K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp, K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp \right) = c(K_1, K_2) < 1. \quad (5.3)$$

Because $K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus$ is a linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, by Fact 2.4, Lemma 2.5(iii) and Fact 2.3(i)&(v), we have that $(K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus)^\perp = K_1 - K_2$ is a linear subspace and that

$$X = (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp \cap (K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus)^\perp = (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp \cap K_1 - K_2. \quad (5.4)$$

Because $K_1 - K_2$ is a linear subspace implies that $K_2 \subseteq K_1 - K_2$, using $K_1 \subseteq K_1 - K_2$ and $K_2 \subseteq K_1 - K_2$, we get that

$$K_1 \cap X = K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp, \quad K_2 \cap X = K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp. \quad (5.5)$$

Moreover, $(K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp$ is a linear subspace and $(K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp - (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp$. Combine this with $(5.4)$ and $(5.5)$ to see that

$$K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp - K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_1 \cap X - K_2 \cap X \subseteq X. \quad (5.6)$$

Using Fact 2.4, Lemma 2.5(i)&(ii) and the assumption $K_1^\perp + K_1 \cap K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_1^\perp$, we have that

$$(K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp)^\ominus \cap X = K_1^\perp + K_1 \cap K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp = K_1^\perp \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp. \quad (5.7)$$

Similarly, using Fact 2.4, Lemma 2.5(i), Fact 2.3(iv) and the assumption $K_2^\perp + K_1 \cap K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_2^\perp$, we see that

$$(K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp)^\ominus \cap X = K_2^\perp + K_1 \cap K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp = K_2^\perp \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp. \quad (5.8)$$

Now use $(5.3)$ and $(5.6)$, and Proposition 5.2 with $K_1 = K_1 \cap X$, $K_2 = K_2 \cap X$, where $X$ is as $(5.4)$, to obtain that $c_0((K_1 \cap X)^\ominus \cap X, (K_2 \cap X)^\ominus \cap X)$, which, recalling $(5.5)$, $(5.7)$, and $(5.8)$, is equivalent to

$$c_0(K_1 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp, K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp) \leq c_0 \left( K_1^\perp \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp, K_2^\perp \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp \right),$$

by Fact 2.14 and Fact 2.3(i), that is, $c(K_1, K_2) \leq c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp)$.

On the other hand, with the additional assumptions, apply the result proved above with $K_1 = K_1^\perp$ and $K_2 = K_2^\perp$ to get that $c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) \leq c(K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) = c(K_1, K_2)$, where the last equation is from Fact 2.3(iv) and Lemma 2.5(ii). Altogether, we have $c(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp)$. □
Remark 5.5. Now suppose that $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2$, and that $K_1$ and $K_2$ are two nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $K_1$ or $K_2$ is not a linear subspace. Assume that $K_1 \cap K_2$ and $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp$ are linear subspaces. By Theorem 4.10(iii), $K_1 \cap K_2$ and $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp$ can not be $\{0\}$ simultaneously. Because $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp = K_1 \cap K_2$, without loss of generality, we assume $K_1 \cap K_2 = \mathbb{R}(0,1)$. Then WLOG we have only the following two case: $K_1 = \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 \geq 0\}$ and $K_2 = \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 \leq 0\}$; or $K_1 = \mathbb{R}(0,1)$ and $K_2 = \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 \leq 0\}$. But in both cases, $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp = \mathbb{R}_+(1,0)$ which is not a linear subspace. Therefore, in $\mathbb{R}^2$, there exist no two cones such that at least one of them is not linear subspace and that these two cones satisfy conditions in Theorem 5.4.

By Corollary 5.6, we know that Theorem 5.4 reduces [4, Theorem 2.16] when $K_1$ and $K_2$ are linear subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$.

Corollary 5.6. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $K_1$ and $K_2$ are closed linear subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$. Then $c(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp)$.

Proof. Because $K_1$ and $K_2$ are closed linear subspaces, by [4, Theorem 2.13],

$$c(K_1, K_2) = 1 \iff K_1 + K_2 \neq \{0\} \iff K_1^\perp + K_2^\perp \neq \{0\} \iff c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) = 1.$$

Assume that $c(K_1, K_2) < 1$. Then by [4, Theorem 2.13], $c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) < 1$. Note that $K_1^\perp = K_1^\perp = K_1^\perp$, and $K_2^\perp = K_2^\perp = K_2^\perp$. Moreover, because $K_1 \perp \perp (K_1 \cap K_2)$, then by [2, Proposition 29.6], $K_1^\perp + (K_1 \cap K_2) = K_1^\perp + K_1 \cap K_2$. Hence, by Lemma 2.6, $K_1^\perp + K_1 \cap K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = (K_1^\perp + K_1 \cap K_2) \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_1^\perp$. Similarly, we have also $K_2^\perp - K_1 \cap K_2 \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_2^\perp$.

Replace $K_1$ and $K_2$ with $K_1^\perp$ and $K_2^\perp$ respectively in the analysis above, to obtain that $K_1 + (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) = K_1$ and $K_2 - (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) = K_2$. Hence, by Theorem 5.4, $c(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) = c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp)$. ■

Corollary 5.7. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be nonempty closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $c(K_1, K_2) < 1$, that $K_1 \cap K_2$ and $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp$ are linear subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$, and that $K_1^\perp + (K_1 \cap K_2)$ and $K_2^\perp + (K_1 \cap K_2)$ are closed. Then

(i) $c(K_1, K_2) \leq c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp)$.

(ii) Assume additionally that $c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) < 1$, and that $K_1 + (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)$ and $K_2 + (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)$ are closed. Then $c(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp)$.

Proof. Because $K_1 \cap K_2$ and $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp$ are linear subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$, by Fact 2.3(v), we have that $K_1^\perp \subseteq (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp$, $K_2^\perp \subseteq (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp$, $K_1^\perp \subseteq (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp$ and $K_2^\perp \subseteq (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp$.

Hence, apply Lemma 2.6 with $A = K_1^\perp$, $B = K_1 \cap K_2$, with $A = K_1^\perp$, $B = K_2 \cap K_2$, with $A = K_1$ and $B = K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp$, and with $A = K_2$ and $B = K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp$, to obtain that $K_1^\perp + (K_1 \cap K_2) \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_1^\perp$, $K_2^\perp + (K_1 \cap K_2) \cap (K_1 \cap K_2)^\perp = K_2^\perp$, $K_1 + (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp = K_1$, and $K_2 + (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp) \cap (K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp)^\perp = K_2$. Therefore, the required results follow from the closedness assumptions and Theorem 5.4. ■

Corollary 5.8. Let $K_1$ and $K_2$ be closed convex cones in $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose that $K_1$ or $K_2$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ and that $K_1^\perp$ or $K_2^\perp$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Assume that $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ and that $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp = \{0\}$. Then

$$c_0(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) = c_0(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp).$$

Proof. Because $K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}$, $K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp = \{0\}$, using the assumptions that $K_1$ or $K_2$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, and that $K_1^\perp$ or $K_2^\perp$ is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathcal{H}$, by Proposition 4.3(iii), we have that

$$c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad c_0(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) < 1. \quad (5.9)$$

By (5.9) and Lemma 2.12(iv), we know that $c(K_1, K_2) < 1$ and $c(K_1^\perp, K_2^\perp) < 1$. Hence, the desired identities are directly from Corollary 5.7. ■
The easiest example illustrating Corollary 5.8 below is when \( \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2 \), \( K_1 = \mathbb{R}(1,0) \) and \( K_2 = \mathbb{R}(1,1) \), we have that \( c_0(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1, K_2) = c(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = \sqrt{2}/2 \). In fact, by Theorem 4.10(iii), when \( K_1 \) or \( K_2 \) is contained in a finite-dimensional linear subspace of \( \mathcal{H} \), in order to satisfy that \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\} \) and that \( K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus = \{0\} \), then both \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) must be closed linear subspaces.

### 6 Counterexamples

In the last section, we mainly provide examples to further study on some earlier results and to show failures when some results in [4, Section 2] on the identities of cosine of angles between linear subspaces was generalized from linear subspaces to general cones.

**Example 6.1.** Suppose that \( \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2 \). Set \( K_1 := \mathbb{R}^+_2 \) and \( K_2 := \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -x_1 \geq x_2\} \). Then the following statements hold:

(i) \( K_1^\ominus = \mathbb{R}^2 \), \( K_2^\ominus = \mathbb{R}_+(1,1) \), \( K_2^\ominus = \mathbb{R}_+(-1,-1) \).

(ii) \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\} \); \( K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus = \{0\} \); \( K_1^\ominus \cap K_2^\ominus = K_2^\ominus \), and \( K_1 + K_2 = \mathbb{R}^2 \).

(iii) \( c(K_1, K_2) = c_0(K_1, K_2) = \sqrt{3}/2 > 0 = c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = c(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = c(K_1^\ominus, K_2) = c(K_1, K_2) \).

(iv) \( c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = 1 \); \( c(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = 0 \); \( c_0(K_1, K_2) < c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) \), and \( c(K_1, K_2) > c(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) \).

**Proof.** It is easy to obtain the required results from the related definitions and Lemma 2.12(ii).

**Example 6.2.** Suppose \( \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^2 \). Set \( K := \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 \geq x_1 \geq 0\} \) and \( M := \mathbb{R}(1,0) \). Then the following statements hold:

(i) \( K \cap M = \{0\} \); \( K^\ominus = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -x_1 \geq x_2 \text{ and } x_2 \leq 0\} \); \( M^\perp = \mathbb{R}(0,1) \); \( K^\ominus \cap M^\perp = \mathbb{R}_+(0,-1) \); and \( (K^\ominus \cap M^\perp)^\ominus = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_2 \geq 0\} \).

(ii) \( c_0(K, M) = c(K, M) = \sqrt{2}/2 \); \( c_0(K^\ominus, M^\perp) = c(K^\ominus, M^\perp) = 1 \); and \( c(K^\ominus, M^\perp) = c(K^\ominus, M^\perp) = 0 \).

**Proof.** The proof is easy from the related definitions and Lemma 2.12(ii).

**Remark 6.3.** Let \( M \) and \( N \) be two linear subspaces of \( \mathcal{H} \). Recall the following known results:

(i) [4, Lemma 2.14] states that if \( c_0(M, N) < 1 \), then for any closed subspace \( X \) which contains \( M + N \), we have \( c_0(M, N) \leq c_0(M^\perp \cap X, N^\perp \cap X) \).

(ii) [4, Theorem 2.15] proves that if \( \mathcal{H} = M \oplus N \), then \( c_0(M, N) = c_0(M^\perp, N^\perp) \).

(iii) [4, Theorem 2.16] shows that \( c(M, N) = c(M^\perp, N^\perp) \).

According to Example 6.1, for the two closed convex cones \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), we see that

\[
c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad c_0(K_1, K_2) > c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus),
\]

and that

\[
K_1 + K_2 = \mathbb{R}^2, \quad K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad c_0(K_1, K_2) > c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) = c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus),
\]

Hence, we conclude that we cannot generalize [4, Lemma 2.14 or Theorem 2.15] from linear subspaces to general cones with replacing the pair of orthogonal complements by one pair of polar cones or one pair of dual cones. This is the reason why we generalize [4, Lemma 2.14 and Theorem 2.15] from linear...
subspaces to general cones with replacing the pair of orthogonal complements by the pair of one polar cone and one dual cone in Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 5.3.

Moreover, in Example 6.2, we have that
\[ c(K, M) > c(K^\oplus, M^\perp) = c(K^\ominus, M^\perp), \]
which illustrates that we cannot generalize [4, Theorem 2.16] from two linear subspaces to one linear subspace and one cone with replacing the pair of orthogonal complements by a pair of one orthogonal complement and one polar cone or by a pair of one orthogonal complement and one dual cone. This is the reason why we generalize [4, Theorem 2.16] from two linear subspaces to one linear subspace and one general cone with replacing the pair of orthogonal complements by the pair of one polar complement and one dual cone in Theorem 5.4.

According to the Example 6.4, we see that \( K \) is closed convex cone and \( M \) is a linear subspace does not imply that \( K + M \) is closed. In addition, \( K^\ominus + M^\perp \) is closed does not imply that \( K + M \) is closed, and, by Fact 2.3(i)&(iv), vice versa. Hence, [4, Lemma 2.11] fails when one of the closed linear subspace is substituted by closed convex cone.

**Example 6.4.** Suppose \( \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^3 \). Set \( K := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq x_3 \} \) and \( M := \mathbb{R}(1, 0, -1) \). Then the following statements hold:

(i) \( K \) is a closed convex cone and \( M \) is a closed linear subspace. Moreover,
\[ K^\ominus = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_3 \leq -\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \} \quad \text{and} \quad M^\perp = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_1 = y_3 \}. \]

(ii) \( K + M \) is not closed.

(iii) \( K \cap M = \mathbb{R}_+(-1, 0, 1) \neq \{0\} \), \( c_0(K, M) = 1 \), and \( c(K, M) = 0 \).

(iv) \( K^\ominus + M^\perp = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 \leq x_1 \} \) is closed.

(v) \( K^\ominus \cap M^\perp = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_1 = y_3 \leq 0, y_2 = 0 \} \) and \( (K^\ominus \cap M^\perp)^\ominus = \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : z_1 + z_3 \geq 0 \}. \)

(vi) \( c_0(K^\ominus, M^\perp) = 1 \) and \( c(K^\ominus, M^\perp) = 0 \).

**Proof.** (i): It is clear that \( M \) is a closed linear subspace, that \( K \) is a closed cone and that \( M^\perp = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_1 = y_3 \}. \)

Because \( K = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \leq x_3 \} = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : \| (x_1, x_2) \| \leq x_3 \} \), then by [1, Thorem 3.3.6], \( K \) is convex and \( K^\ominus = -K = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_3 \leq -\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \}. \)

(ii): We first show that \( (0, 1, 0) \notin K + M \). Assume to the contrary that \( (0, 1, 0) \in K + M \). Then there exist \( (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in K \) and \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( (0, 1, 0) = (x_1, x_2, x_3) + (t, 0, -t) = (x_1 + t, x_2, x_3 - t) \), which implies that \( t = -x_1 = x_3 \) and \( x_2 = 1 \). Then \( x_1^2 + x_2^2 = t^2 + 1 > t^2 = x_3^2 \), which contradicts with the assumption that \( (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in K \). On the other hand, \( (0, 1, 0) = \lim_{t \to \infty} (0, 1 + \frac{1}{t}, -t + \sqrt{t^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{t})^2}) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \left( -t, 1 + \frac{1}{t}, \sqrt{t^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{t})^2} \right) = (1, 0, -1) \in K + M \). Altogether, \( K + M \) is not closed.

(iii): Because \( (\forall (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in K) \, x_3 \geq 0 \), it is easy to see that \( K \cap M = \mathbb{R}_+(-1, 0, 1) \neq \{0\} \). Then by Lemma 4.1(i), \( c_0(K, M) = 1 \). In addition, note that \( (K \cap M)^\ominus = (\mathbb{R}_+(-1, 0, 1))^\ominus = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_3 \leq -\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \} \).
\[ \mathbb{R}^3 : -y_1 + y_3 \leq 0, \]  
and so \( K \cap (K \cap M)^\circ = \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0, 1) \) and \( M \cap (K \cap M)^\circ = \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0, -1) \). Hence, 
\( c(K, M) = c_0(K \cap (K \cap M)^\circ, M \cap (K \cap M)^\circ) = 0. \)

(iv): Denote by \( B := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_3 \leq x_1 \} \). Let \( (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in B \). Then by (i),
\[
(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left( \frac{x_1 - x_3}{2}, 0, \frac{x_3 - x_1}{2} \right) + \left( \frac{x_1 + x_3}{2}, x_2, \frac{x_1 + x_3}{2} \right) \in K^\circ + M^\perp,
\]
which deduces that \( B \subseteq K^\circ + M^\perp \).

On the other hand, let \( (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in B^c \), that is, \( x_3 > x_1 \). Assume to the contrary that \( (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in K^\circ + M^\perp \). Then \( (x_1, x_2, x_3) = (y_1, y_2, y_3) + (z_1, z_2, z_3) \) such that \( y_3 \leq -\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \) and \( z_1 = z_3 \). Now, \( x_1 = y_1 + z_1 \) and \( x_3 = y_3 + z_3 \). Combine this with \( x_3 > x_1 \) and \( y_3 \leq -\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \) to obtain that \( y_1 \geq -\sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \geq y_3 > y_1 \), which is a contradiction. Hence, \( B^c \subseteq (K^\circ + M^\perp)^c \). Therefore, \( K^\circ + M^\perp = B \) is closed.

(v): Denote by \( C := \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_1 = y_3 \leq 0, y_2 = 0 \} \). By (i), \( C \subseteq K^\circ \cap M^\perp \).

Let \( (y_1, y_2, y_3) \in K^\circ \cap M^\perp \). Then by (i), we know that \( (y_1, y_2, y_3) \in K^\circ \) and \( y_1 = y_3 \leq 0 \). Note that \( |y_3| \geq \sqrt{y_1^2 + y_2^2} \geq |y_1| \). So, we have that \( y_2 = 0 \). Hence, \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp = C \). In addition, by the definition of polar cone and \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp = \{(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y_1 = y_3 \leq 0, y_2 = 0 \} \), we obtain that \( (K^\circ \cap M^\perp)^\circ = \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : z_1 + z_3 \geq 0 \} \).

(vi): Because, by (v), \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp \neq \{0\} \), by Lemma 4.1(i), we have that \( c_0(K^\circ, M^\perp) = 1 \). Moreover, by (i) and (v), \( K^\circ \cap (K^\circ \cap M^\perp)^\circ = \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0, -1) \) and \( M^\perp \cap (K^\circ \cap M^\perp)^\circ = \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0, 1) \). Hence, by Fact 2.14 and Definition 2.9, \( c(K^\circ, M^\perp) = c_0(K^\circ \cap (K^\circ \cap M^\perp)^\circ, M^\perp \cap (K^\circ \cap M^\perp)^\circ) = 0. \)

**Example 6.5.** Suppose \( H = \mathbb{R}^2 \). Set \( K := \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq 0 \} \) and \( M := \mathbb{R}(1, 0) \). Then the following statements hold:

(i) \( K^\circ = \{(x_1, x_2) : -x_1 \geq x_2 \text{ and } x_1 \leq 0 \} \), and \( M^\perp = \mathbb{R}(0, 1) \).

(ii) \( K \cap M = \mathbb{R}_+(1, 0) \neq \{0\} \), \( K + M = \{(x_1, x_2) : x_2 \geq 0 \} \), and \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp = \mathbb{R}_+(0, -1) \neq \{0\} \).

(iii) \( c_0(K, M) = 1 \), \( c(K, M) = 0 \), \( c_0(K^\circ, M^\perp) = 1 \), and \( c(K^\circ, M^\perp) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \).

**Proof.** This is clear from the definitions.

**Remark 6.6.**

(i) In Example 6.4, we have that \( K \cap M \neq \{0\} \) and \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp \neq \{0\} \), and that \( c(K, M) = c_0(K^\circ, M^\perp) \). In Example 6.5, although we have also that \( K \cap M \neq \{0\} \) and \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp \neq \{0\} \), now \( c(K, M) = 0 \neq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} = c(K^\circ, M^\perp) \). Hence, we know that generally, \( K \cap M \neq \{0\} \) and \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp \neq \{0\} \) do not imply that \( c(K, M) = c(K^\circ, M^\perp) \).

(ii) By Proposition 4.3(iii) and Theorem 4.5, the conditions (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) in Corollary 4.7 are equivalent in finite-dimensional spaces. Note that in Example 6.5, \( K + M \) is closed, but \( c_0(K, M) = 1 \) and \( K \cap M \neq \{0\} \). Hence, \( K + M \) is closed generically not a sufficient condition for any of the conditions (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) in Corollary 4.7, even if one of cone is linear subspace.

(iii) Suppose that the \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) in Theorem 4.10 are respectively \( K \) and \( M \) in Example 6.5. Now, we have that (i), (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 4.10 hold, and that \( K^\circ \cap M^\perp \neq \{0\} \), but \( K \cap M \neq \{0\} \). Hence, we conclude that under conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 4.10, \( K^\circ \cap K^\circ \neq \{0\} \) generally does not imply \( K_1 \cap K_2 = \{0\} \), although the converse statement was shown in Theorem 4.10.
7 Conclusion

In this work, we showed the existence of principal vectors of two nonempty convex sets and provided necessary conditions for a pair of vectors in $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ to be a pair of principal vectors of two nonempty convex sets. We also characterized the cosine of the minimal angle between two closed convex cones being strictly less than 1 and presented sufficient conditions for the closedness of the sum of two nonempty closed convex cones in Hilbert spaces. Moreover, we proved that for two nonempty closed convex cones $K_1$ and $K_2$, under some conditions (e.g., the space is finite-dimensional), if one of the cone is not linear subspace, then $c_0(K_1, K_2) < 1$ and $c_0(K_1^\ominus, K_2^\ominus) < 1$ cannot occur together. In addition, we generalized [4, Lemma 2.14, Theorems 2.15 and 2.16] from linear subspaces to general cones and obtained several identities on minimal angle and angle between nonempty closed convex cones. Last but not least, some counterexamples were constructed to show the tightness of our assumptions in the earlier results.
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