

# Roots of the identity operator and proximal mappings: (classical and phantom) cycles and gap vectors

Heinz H. Bauschke\* and Xianfu Wang†

February 22, 2022

## Abstract

Recently, Simons provided a lemma for a support function of a closed convex set in a general Hilbert space and used it to prove the geometry conjecture on cycles of projections. In this paper, we extend Simons's lemma to closed convex functions, show its connections to Attouch–Théra duality, and use it to characterize (classical and phantom) cycles and gap vectors of proximal mappings.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** Primary 47H05, 52A41, 47H10; Secondary 49J53, 46C05, 90C25.

**Keywords:** Attouch–Théra duality, convex function, cycle, Fenchel conjugate, gap vector, phantom cycle, phantom gap vector, root of identity operator, Simons's lemma, translation-invariant function.

## 1 Introduction

In [11], Simons provides a new framework for studying the geometry conjecture on cycles and gap vectors for cyclic projections; see also [1]. His ingenious analysis is mainly based on two technical lemmas: one for the support function of a nonempty closed, convex subset, and the other for the negative displacement mapping on the null space of an averaged operator involving the  $m$ th root of the identity operator.

---

\*Mathematics, Irving K. Barber School, University of British Columbia Okanagan, Kelowna, British Columbia V1V 1V7, Canada. E-mail: [heinz.bauschke@ubc.ca](mailto:heinz.bauschke@ubc.ca).

†Mathematics, Irving K. Barber School, University of British Columbia Okanagan, Kelowna, British Columbia V1V 1V7, Canada. E-mail: [shawn.wang@ubc.ca](mailto:shawn.wang@ubc.ca).

*Contributions.* Our goal in this paper is to extend Simons's results from support functions to proper lower semicontinuous convex functions, and use them to study classical and phantom cycles and gap vectors for proximal mappings, which significantly generalize some results in [11, 3]. One distinguishing feature is that we can study phantom cycles and gap vectors of a convex function associated with an arbitrary isometry, rather than just the right-shift operator like [3].

*Notation and terminology.* Notation is largely from [6, 12] to which we refer for background material on proximal mappings, convex analysis, and monotone operator theory. Throughout this paper, we assume that  $X$  is a real Hilbert space with inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and induced norm  $\|\cdot\| = \sqrt{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$ . The set of proper lower semicontinuous convex functions from  $X$  to  $] -\infty, +\infty]$  is denoted by  $\Gamma_0(X)$ . Let  $f, g : X \rightarrow ] -\infty, +\infty]$ . The *Fenchel conjugate* of  $f$  is

$$f^* : X \rightarrow ] -\infty, +\infty] : x^* \mapsto \sup_{x \in X} (\langle x, x^* \rangle - f(x)).$$

The *infimal convolution* of  $f$  and  $g$  is  $f \square g : X \rightarrow ] -\infty, +\infty] : x \mapsto \inf_{y \in X} (f(y) + g(x - y))$ , and it is exact at a point  $x \in X$  if  $(\exists y \in X) (f \square g)(x) = f(y) + g(x - y)$ . The *subdifferential* of  $f$  is the set-valued operator

$$\partial f : X \rightrightarrows X : x \mapsto \{x^* \in X \mid (\forall y \in X) f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle x^*, y - x \rangle\}.$$

For  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$ , its *proximal mapping* is defined by  $\text{Prox}_f = (\text{Id} + \partial f)^{-1}$ . We use  $\text{cl} f$  for the *lower semicontinuous convex hull* of  $f$ . For a set  $C \subseteq X$ , its *indicator function* is defined by

$$\iota_C(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in C; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } x \notin C. \end{cases}$$

The closure of  $C$  will be denoted by  $\overline{C}$ . When the set  $C$  is convex, closed, and nonempty, then we write  $P_C$  for the *projection operator* onto  $C$  and  $N_C = \partial \iota_C$  for the *normal cone operator*.

An operator  $N : X \rightarrow X$  is *nonexpansive* if  $(\forall x, y \in X) \|Nx - Ny\| \leq \|x - y\|$ ; *firmly nonexpansive* if  $2N - \text{Id}$  is nonexpansive;  $\beta$ -*cocercive* if  $\beta N$  is firmly nonexpansive for some  $\beta \in ]0, +\infty[$ . Prime examples of firmly nonexpansive mappings are proximal mappings of elements of  $\Gamma_0(X)$ . As usual,  $\text{Fix } N = \{x \in X \mid Nx = x\}$  denotes the set of fixed points of  $N$ . For a set-valued operator  $A : X \rightrightarrows X$ , the sets  $\text{dom } A = \{x \in X \mid Ax \neq \emptyset\}$ ,  $\text{ran } A = A(X)$ , and  $\text{ker } A = A^{-1}(0)$  are the *domain*, *range*, and *kernel* of  $A$  respectively. For a linear operator  $R : X \rightarrow X$ ,  $R^*$  denotes its *Hilbert adjoint*, see, e.g., [6, 9].

*Background and motivation.* Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  and  $R : X \rightarrow X$  be a nonexpansive linear operator. Every  $z \in X$  satisfying

$$z = \text{Prox}_f Rz, \text{ equivalently,} \tag{1}$$

in terms of monotone operators

$$0 \in \partial f(z) + z - Rz. \tag{2}$$

is called a *cycle* of  $f$  associated with  $R$ . Denote  $Z = \{z \in X \mid z = \text{Prox}_f Rz\}$ . The set of *gap vectors* of  $f$  is defined as  $G = \{Rz - z \mid z \in Z\}$ . These concepts become more meaningful and geometric,

when  $f$  is a decomposable sum and  $R$  is the right-shift operator (see below) on the product space  $X^m$  with  $m \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ . More precisely, equip the product space  $X^m$  with the inner product norm  $\|x\| = \sqrt{\|x_1\|^2 + \dots + \|x_m\|^2}$  for  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \in X^m$ . Define the right-shift operator

$$R : X^m \rightarrow X^m : (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \mapsto (x_m, x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}) \quad (3)$$

and a decomposable sum of functions

$$f = f_1 \oplus \dots \oplus f_m : X^m \rightarrow ]-\infty, +\infty] : (x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x_i) \quad (4)$$

where  $(f_i)_{i=1}^m$  in  $\Gamma_0(X)$ . A *classical cycle (or proximal cycle)* of  $f$  is a vector  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \in X^m$  such that

$$z_1 = \text{Prox}_{f_1} z_m, \quad z_2 = \text{Prox}_{f_2} z_1, \quad z_3 = \text{Prox}_{f_3} z_2, \dots, \quad (5a)$$

$$z_{m-1} = \text{Prox}_{f_{m-1}} z_{m-2}, \quad z_m = \text{Prox}_{f_m} z_{m-1}, \quad (5b)$$

see, e.g., [3]. Such a  $z$  is precisely a solution to (1) with  $f$  and  $R$  given by (4) and (3) respectively. In particular, for  $f_i = \iota_{C_i}$  with  $C_i$  being a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$ ,  $Z$  gives the *classical cycles* associated with the family of projections  $P_{C_i}$ . See [2, 1, 3, 11] for further details.

*Outline.* The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide some new properties of an averaged operator of powers of  $m$ th roots of the identity operator. In Section 3 we extend Simons's lemma to lower semicontinuous convex functions and establish its connections to Attouch–Théra duality. Section 4 contains characterizations of classical cycle and gap vectors. In the final section 5 we give characterizations of phantom cycles and gap vectors.

## 2 The associated average operator: kernel and range

Let  $R : X \rightarrow X$  be linear and  $R^m = \text{Id}$ . Define the average operator

$$A = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m R^i, \quad \text{and } Y = \ker(A) = \{y \in X \mid Ay = 0\}.$$

Also define  $S : X \rightarrow X$  by  $S = R - \text{Id}$  and  $Q : X \rightarrow X$  by  $Q = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} iR^i$ , and  $Q_0 = Q|_Y$ , the restriction of  $Q$  to  $Y$ . Linear operators  $A, S, Q$  and subspace  $Y$  are crucial in the analysis of [11]. In this section, we show that  $A$  is in fact a projection, and that  $Y = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp = \text{ran } S$  whenever  $R$  is an isometry.

We start with the following fact by Simons [11]. We will use these properties throughout the paper.

**Fact 2.1 (Simons)** *The following hold:*

- (i)  $S(X) \subseteq Y$ , and  $Q(Y) \subseteq Y$ .

- (ii)  $(\forall y \in Y) S(Qy) = y$ , and  $Q(Sy) = y$ .
- (iii)  $AS = SA = 0$ .
- (iv)  $SQ = QS = \text{Id} - A$ .
- (v)  $-Q_0 - \text{Id}/2$  is skew and so maximally monotone on  $Y$ .
- (vi) If  $R$  is an isometry, then  $(\forall x \in X) 2\langle x, Sx \rangle + \|Sx\|^2 = 0$ .

**Example 2.2** A linear operator  $R : X \rightarrow X$  satisfying  $R^m = \text{Id}$  does not imply  $R$  nonexpansive. Let  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$  be the canonical base of the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .

- (i) Bambahi–Chowla’s matrix (1946): Set

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $B_1^5 = \text{Id}$  but  $\|B_1 e_1\| = \sqrt{2} > 1 = \|e_1\|$ .

- (ii) Set

$$B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & -2 & -3 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $B_2^2 = \text{Id}$  but  $\|B_2 e_4\| = \sqrt{20} > 1 = \|e_4\|$ .

- (iii) Turnbull’s matrix (1927): Set

$$B_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ -3 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ -3 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $B_3^3 = \text{Id}$  but  $\|B_3 e_1\| = \sqrt{20} > 1 = \|e_1\|$ .

See [8] for further information on roots of matrices. However, the following holds.

**Proposition 2.3** *Let  $R : X \rightarrow X$  be linear and  $R^m = \text{Id}$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $R$  is nonexpansive.
- (ii)  $R$  is an isometry.

(iii)  $R^*$  is nonexpansive.

(iv)  $R^*$  is an isometry.

*Proof.* “(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii)”: Suppose  $R$  is nonexpansive. Then  $\|R\| \leq 1$ . Using  $R^m = \text{Id}$ , we obtain

$$(\forall x \in X) \|x\| = \|R^m x\| \leq \|R^{m-1} x\| \leq \cdots \leq \|Rx\| \leq \|x\|,$$

so  $(\forall x \in X) \|Rx\| = \|x\|$ . Hence  $R$  is isometric. “(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i)”: Clear.

By the assumption,  $R^* : X \rightarrow X$  is linear and  $(R^*)^m = \text{Id}$ . Similar argument applying to  $R^*$  yields (iii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iv). Finally (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) follows from  $\|R\| = \|R^*\|$ .  $\blacksquare$

With Example 2.2 and Proposition 2.3 in mind, when  $R$  is an isometry we have the following new properties of  $A$  and  $S$ .

**Theorem 2.4** *Suppose that  $R$  is an isometry. Then the following hold:*

(i)  $\ker A = \ker A^* = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp = (\text{Fix } R^*)^\perp$ .

(ii)  $A = P_{\text{Fix } R} = P_{\text{Fix } R^*} = A^*$ . In particular,  $\text{ran } A = \text{ran } A^* = \text{Fix } R$  is closed.

(iii)  $\text{ran } S = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp = \text{ran } S^*$ . In particular,  $\text{ran } S = \text{ran } S^*$  is closed.

*Proof.* (i). Fact 2.1(iii) gives  $\text{ran } A \subseteq \ker S = \text{Fix } R$  and  $A^* S^* = S^* A^* = 0$ , so that  $\text{ran } A^* \subseteq \ker S^* = \text{Fix } R^*$ . Because  $R$  is nonexpansive and  $\|R^*\| = \|R\|$ ,  $R^*$  is nonexpansive. Then both  $\text{Id} - R$  and  $\text{Id} - R^*$  are maximally monotone linear operators. [5, Proposition 3.1] or [7, Theorem 3.2(i)] gives

$$\text{Fix } R = \ker(\text{Id} - R) = \ker(\text{Id} - R^*) = \text{Fix } R^*.$$

We have

$$\ker A = (\text{ran } A^*)^\perp \supseteq (\text{Fix } R^*)^\perp = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp. \quad (6)$$

To show the converse inclusion, let  $y \in \ker A$ . We show  $y \in (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . As  $y \in \ker A$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^m R^i y = 0$ . For  $x \in \text{Fix } R = \text{Fix } R^*$ , we have  $\langle R^i y, x \rangle = \langle y, (R^*)^i x \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle$ . Then

$$0 = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^m R^i y, x \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle R^i y, x \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle y, x \rangle = m \langle y, x \rangle,$$

i.e.,  $\langle y, x \rangle = 0$ . Since this holds for every  $x \in \text{Fix } R$ , we obtain  $y \in (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . Hence  $\ker A = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . Using a similar argument with  $A$  and  $A^*$  interchanged and  $R$  and  $R^*$  interchanged gives  $\ker A^* = (\text{Fix } R^*)^\perp = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ .

(ii). We have  $\overline{\text{ran } A} = (\ker A^*)^\perp = ((\text{Fix } R)^\perp)^\perp = \text{Fix } R$ . For every  $x \in \text{Fix } R$ , we have  $Ax = x$  and so  $\text{Fix } R \subseteq \text{ran } A$ . Thus,

$$\text{Fix } R \subseteq \text{ran } A \subseteq \overline{\text{ran } A} = \text{Fix } R,$$

which gives  $\text{ran } A = \text{Fix } R$ . Applying this to  $A^*$  yields  $\text{ran } A^* = \text{Fix } R^* = \text{Fix } R$ .

To show  $A = P_{\text{Fix } R}$ , we use  $\ker A = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$  and  $\text{ran } A = \text{Fix } R$ . For every  $u \in \text{Fix } R$ , we have  $Au = u$  by the definition of  $A$ ; for every  $v \in (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$  we have  $Av = 0$ . For each  $x \in X$ , by the orthogonal decomposition theorem,  $x = u + v$  for some unique  $u \in \text{Fix } R, v \in (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . It follows that

$$Ax = A(u + v) = Au + Av = Au = u = P_{\text{Fix } R}u = P_{\text{Fix } R}(u + v) = P_{\text{Fix } R}x.$$

Hence  $A = P_{\text{Fix } R}$  and so  $A^* = P_{\text{Fix } R}^* = P_{\text{Fix } R}$ .

(iii). Let  $y \in \text{ran } S$ . By [7, Theorem 3.2(ii)],  $\overline{\text{ran}}(\text{Id} - R) = \overline{\text{ran}}(\text{Id} - R^*)$ . Then

$$y \in \overline{\text{ran}}S = \overline{\text{ran}}S^* = (\ker S)^\perp = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$$

so  $\text{ran } S \subseteq (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . Conversely, let  $y \in (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . As in [2, Proposition 3.1], setting

$$x = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-2} (m-1-k)R^k y,$$

we show  $y = S(-x)$ . Indeed, using  $A = P_{\text{Fix } R}$ , we have

$$Sx = (R - \text{Id})x = \frac{1}{m}(R - \text{Id}) \sum_{k=0}^{m-2} (m-1-k)R^k y \quad (7)$$

$$= \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} R^k - \text{Id} \right) y = (P_{\text{Fix } R} - \text{Id})y = -P_{(\text{Fix } R)^\perp} y = -y. \quad (8)$$

Hence  $(\text{Fix } R)^\perp \subseteq \text{ran } S$ . Altogether,  $\text{ran } S = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . In view of Proposition 2.3, applying similar argument to  $S^*$  yields  $\text{ran } S^* = (\text{Fix } R^*)^\perp = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . ■

**Remark 2.5** (i) The referee suggested that “ $\text{ran } S = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ ” in Theorem 2.4(iii) can also be proved in the following way: By virtue of (i) it suffices to prove that  $\text{ran } S = \ker A$ . If  $y \in \text{ran } S$  then, for some  $x \in X$ ,  $y = Sx = Rx - x$ , so  $Ay = ARx - Ax = Ax - Ax = 0$ , and  $y \in \ker A$ . Thus  $\text{ran } S \subseteq \ker A$ . If conversely,  $y \in \ker A$  then Fact 2.1(iv) gives  $y = y - Ay = SQy \in \text{ran } S$ . Thus  $\ker A \subseteq \text{ran } S$ . So we have proved that  $\text{ran } S = \ker A$ , as required.

(ii) The proof of Theorem 2.4(ii) gives a new proof of the right identity in (4) of [2, Proposition 2.4].

**Example 2.6** Consider the following isometric mapping  $R$ .

(i) Define the right-shift operator  $R : X^m \rightarrow X^m$  by

$$R(x_1, \dots, x_m) = (x_m, x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}).$$

Then  $R^m = \text{Id}$ ,  $\text{Fix } R = \Delta$  so that  $A = P_\Delta$  and  $\ker A = \Delta^\perp$ , where  $\Delta = \{(x, \dots, x) \in X^m \mid x \in X\}$ .

- (ii) Define the identity operator  $R : X \rightarrow X$  by  $R := \text{Id}$ . Then  $\text{Fix } R = X$ ,  $A = \text{Id}$  and  $\ker A = \{0\}$ .
- (iii) Define the rotator  $R : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  by  $R := R_{\alpha\pi}$  where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \cap ]0, 2[$ . Let  $m$  be in  $\mathbb{N}$  such that  $m\alpha \in 2\mathbb{N}$ . Then  $R^m = \text{Id}$ ,  $\text{Fix } R = \{0\}$ ,  $A = 0$ , and  $\ker A = \mathbb{R}^2$ .

**Example 2.7** Without  $R$  being isometric, Theorem 2.4(ii) fails. Take  $B_2$  in Example 2.2(ii) where  $m = 2$  to obtain

$$A = \frac{1}{2}(B_2 + B_2^2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -3/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 3/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Because  $\|Ae_4\| = \sqrt{19/4} > \|e_4\|$ , the operator  $A$  can neither be nonexpansive nor a projection operator.

In view of Theorem 2.4, in the remainder of this paper, we shall assume that  $R$  is an isometry and  $Y = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ .

### 3 Extended Simons's lemma and Attouch–Théra duality

Let  $Y, S, Q$  be given as in Section 2. We call the following result the *extended Simons's lemma*. In [11, Lemma 16], Simons only proved this when  $f = \sigma_C$ , a support function of a closed convex set  $C \subseteq X$ . Our proof here also follows the idea of his [11, Lemma 16]. We also observe the uniqueness.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  with  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$ . Then there exists a unique pair of vectors  $(e, d) = (e_f, d_f) \in Y \times Y$  such that  $d = Se \in \text{dom } f^*$ ,  $e = Qd$ , and*

$$(\forall y \in Y) f^*(Se) + \langle y - Se, e \rangle - f^*(y) \leq 0;$$

*equivalently,  $e \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(Se)$ . Consequently,  $(\forall x \in X) f^*(Se) + \langle Sx - Se, e \rangle - f^*(Sx) \leq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $g = f^*|_Y$ . The assumption on  $f$  implies  $g \in \Gamma_0(Y)$  so that  $\partial g$  is maximally monotone on  $Y$  by [6, Theorem 20.25]. From Fact 2.1(v),  $-Q_0 - \text{Id}/2$  is maximally monotone on  $Y$ . Since  $-Q_0 - \text{Id}/2$  has full domain, the operator  $(-Q_0 - \text{Id}/2) + \partial g$ , being a sum of two maximally monotone operators, is maximally monotone on  $Y$  by [6, Corollary 25.5] or [10, Theorem 1], and so is  $-2Q_0 - \text{Id} + 2\partial g$ . Minty's theorem, see, e.g., [6, Theorem 21.1], implies that there exists a *unique* vector  $d \in Y$  such that  $0 \in -2Q_0d + 2\partial g(d)$ , i.e.,

$$Q_0d \in \partial g(d). \tag{9}$$

Put  $Q_0d = e$ . From Fact 2.1(ii) or Fact 2.1(iv) and the definition of  $Y$  we get  $d = SQ_0d = Se$  and

$$(\forall y \in Y) g(d) + \langle e, y - Se \rangle = g(d) + \langle Q_0d, y - d \rangle \leq g(y); \tag{10}$$

equivalently,  $(\forall y \in Y) f^*(Se) + \langle y - Se, e \rangle \leq f^*(y) \Leftrightarrow (f^* + \iota_Y)(Se) + (f^* + \iota_Y)^*(e) \leq \langle Se, e \rangle \Leftrightarrow e \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(Se)$ . Finally, (10) is equivalent to (9) which in turn has a *unique* solution  $d$  by Minty's theorem.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  with  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$ . Then the vector  $e = e_f \in Y$  from Lemma 3.1 is the unique vector satisfying*

$$(f^* + \iota_Y)(Se) - \langle Se, e \rangle + \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) \quad (11)$$

$$= (f^* + \iota_Y)(Se) - \langle Se, e \rangle + (f^* + \iota_Y)^*(e) = 0. \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* Lemma 3.1 shows that  $e$  is the unique vector satisfying  $e \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(Se)$ . Because  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$ , [6, Theorem 15.1] implies that  $f \square \iota_{Y^\perp}$  is proper, convex and bounded below by a continuous affine function, and that  $(f^* + \iota_Y)^* = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})$ . The result now follows from the characterization of equality in the Fenchel–Young inequality.  $\blacksquare$

The extended Simons's lemma is closely related to Attouch–Théra duality, as we show next. Attouch–Théra duality is a powerful tool in studying primal-dual solutions of monotone inclusion problems.

**Fact 3.3 (Attouch–Théra duality [4])** *Let  $A, B : X \rightrightarrows X$  be maximally monotone operators. Let  $C$  be the solution set of the primal problem:*

$$\text{find } x \in X \text{ such that } 0 \in Ax + Bx. \quad (13)$$

*Let  $C^*$  be the solution set of the dual problem associated with the ordered pair  $(A, B)$ :*

$$\text{find } x^* \in X \text{ such that } 0 \in A^{-1}x^* + \tilde{B}(x^*), \quad (14)$$

*where  $\tilde{B} = (-\text{Id}) \circ B^{-1} \circ (-\text{Id})$ . Then*

$$(i) \ C = \{x \in X \mid (\exists x^* \in C^*) \ x^* \in Ax \text{ and } -x^* \in Bx\}.$$

$$(ii) \ C^* = \{x^* \in X \mid (\exists x \in C) \ x \in A^{-1}x^* \text{ and } -x \in \tilde{B}(x^*)\}.$$

**Definition 3.4** *We refer to (13) and (14) as an Attouch–Théra primal-dual inclusion pair.*

**Theorem 3.5** *Let  $R$  be an isometry and  $Y = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ , let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  with  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$ , and let  $(e, d) \in Y \times Y$  be given by Lemma 3.1. Consider the Attouch–Théra primal-dual inclusion problem:*

$$(P) \quad 0 \in \partial \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(x) + (\text{Id} - R)x, \quad (15)$$

$$(D) \quad 0 \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(y) + (\text{Id} - R)^{-1}y. \quad (16)$$

*Then the following hold:*

(i)  $(e, d)$  is a solution to the primal-dual problem (15)–(16), i.e.,  $e$  solves  $(P)$  and  $d$  solves  $(D)$ . Moreover,  $d$  is the unique solution of  $(D)$ .

(ii)  $(e, d)$  is the unique solution of the primal-dual problem

$$(P') \quad 0 \in \partial \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(x) + (\text{Id} - R)x \text{ and } x \in Y, \quad (17)$$

$$(D') \quad 0 \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(y) + (\text{Id} - R)^{-1}y. \quad (18)$$

More specifically,  $e$  is the unique solution of  $(P')$  and  $d$  is the unique solution of  $(D')$ .

*Proof.* (i): It is clear that (15) and (16) is an Attouch–Théra primal-dual inclusion pair, because  $[\partial \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})]^{-1} = \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)$  and  $\widetilde{\text{Id} - R} = (\text{Id} - R)^{-1}$ . We only need to verify that  $(e, d)$  is a solution to the pair. By Lemma 3.2,  $(e, d) \in Y \times Y$ ,  $Se = d$ , and

$$(f^* + \iota_Y)(Se) - \langle Se, e \rangle + (f^* + \iota_Y)^*(e) = 0.$$

Then  $Se \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)^*(e)$ , that is,  $0 \in (\text{Id} - R)(e) + \partial \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e)$ . Hence  $e$  solves  $(P)$ .

Also,  $e \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(Se) = \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(d)$ . This gives

$$0 \in -e + \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(d).$$

Since  $-e = -Qd$  and  $S(Qd) = d$ , we obtain  $Qd \in S^{-1}(d)$  and

$$0 \in -S^{-1}(d) + \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(d) = (\text{Id} - R)^{-1}(d) + \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(d).$$

Hence  $d$  solves  $(D)$ . Note that  $(D) = (D')$  and we will address uniqueness in the proof of (ii) which we tackle next.

(ii): By (i), (17)–(18) has at least one solution. It remains to prove the uniqueness.

Now the solution to  $0 \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(y) + (\text{Id} - R)^{-1}y$ , i.e., to  $(D) = (D')$  is unique because  $\partial(f^* + \iota_Y) + (\text{Id} - R)^{-1}$  is strongly monotone: indeed, since  $(\text{Id} - R)^{-1} = -S^{-1}$ ,  $\text{dom } S^{-1} = \text{ran } S = Y$  by Theorem 2.4, and  $-S^{-1}|_Y = -Q_0$  is strongly monotone on  $Y$  by Fact 2.1, we deduce that  $(\text{Id} - R)^{-1}$  is strongly monotone; or apply the cocoercivity of  $\text{Id} - R$ , see, e.g., [3, Fact 2.8]. Being a sum of a monotone operator and a strongly monotone operator,  $\partial(f^* + \iota_Y) + (\text{Id} - R)^{-1}$  is strongly monotone.

We have seen that  $d$  is the unique solution to  $(D) = (D')$ . Now let  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  be two solutions of  $(P')$ , i.e., of  $(P)$  with the additional requirement that  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  lie in  $Y$ . By Fact 3.3(i),  $(\text{Id} - R)y_1 = d = (\text{Id} - R)y_2$ . Hence  $y_1 - y_2 \in Y \cap \text{Fix } R = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp \cap \text{Fix } R = \{0\}$  and therefore  $y_1 = y_2$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 3.6** (i) The referee provided a simpler proof of the uniqueness of the solution to  $(D)$ :  $y$  is a solution to  $D$  when there exists  $u \in X$  such that  $(\text{Id} - R)u = y$  and  $-u \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(y)$ . Then  $y = -Su$  and so  $-u \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(-Su)$ . If  $y'$  is also a solution to  $(D)$  then there exists  $u' \in X$  such that  $y' = -Su'$  and  $-u' \in \partial(f^* + \iota_Y)(-Su')$ . Consequently,  $\langle u' - u, Su' - Su \rangle \geq$

0. From Fact 2.1(vi),  $Su' = Su$ , and so  $y' = y$ . A similar argument shows that the solution to  $(P')$  is also unique: If  $x, x'$  are solutions to  $(P')$  then  $Sx \in \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(x)$  and  $Sx' \in \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(x')$ . Consequently,  $\langle x' - x, Sx' - Sx \rangle \geq 0$ . From Fact 2.1(vi),  $Sx' - Sx = 0$ , that is to say,  $x - x' \in \ker S = \text{Fix } R$ . From Theorem 2.4(i),  $x - x' \in \ker A = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . So  $x' = x$ .

- (ii) In [3],  $e$  and  $d$  are called “generalized cycle” and “generalized gap vector” of  $f$ , respectively. In view of Theorem 3.5, these vectors are the classical cycle and gap vectors of  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})$  whenever  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$ . While the solution to (15) need not be unique, the inclusion (17) always has a unique solution.

## 4 Characterizations of classical cycle and gap vectors

We can use the results from Section 3 to study classical cycles and gap vectors. While the pair  $(e, d) \in Y \times Y$  given by Lemma 3.1 always exists, the set of classical cycle and gap vectors of  $f$  might be empty; see, e.g., [1, 3]. We start with some elementary properties of translation-invariant functions whose simple proofs we omit.

**Definition 4.1** *We say that  $f : X \rightarrow ]-\infty, +\infty]$  is translation-invariant with respect to a subset  $C$  of  $X$  if  $f(x + c) = f(x)$  for every  $x \in X$  and  $c \in C$ .*

Clearly, we have

**Lemma 4.2** *If  $f : X \rightarrow ]-\infty, +\infty]$  is translation-invariant with respect to  $C$ , then  $C + \text{dom } f \subseteq \text{dom } f$ .*

**Lemma 4.3** *If  $f : X \rightarrow ]-\infty, +\infty]$  is translation-invariant with respect to  $Y^\perp$ , then  $f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}} = f$ .*

**Lemma 4.4** *The following hold for every proper function  $f : X \rightarrow ]-\infty, +\infty]$ :*

- (i)  $f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}$  is translation-invariant with respect to  $Y^\perp$ .
- (ii) The function  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})$  is translation-invariant with respect to  $Y^\perp$ , namely,

$$(\forall x \in X)(\forall z \in Y^\perp) \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(x + z) = \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(x).$$

Combining Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 we obtain:

**Corollary 4.5** *The following hold for every function  $f : X \rightarrow ]-\infty, +\infty]$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})) \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}} &= \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}), \\ \text{cl}[(\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})) \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}] &= \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.1, we have the following characterizations of the classical cycles of  $f$ . In the proof of this theorem we shall use Fact 2.1(v) many times without making explicit reference to it.

**Theorem 4.6** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  with  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$  and let  $(e, d) \in Y \times Y$  be given by Lemma 3.1. Then the following statements are equivalent for every  $z \in X$ :*

- (i)  $z = \text{Prox}_f Rz$ .
- (ii)  $f^*(Sz) + f(z) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 = 0$ .
- (iii)  $Sz = d$  and  $f(z) = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e)$ .
- (iv)  $Sz = d$  and  $f(z) = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(z)$ .

*Proof.* (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii):  $z = \text{Prox}_f Rz \Leftrightarrow Rz \in z + \partial f(z) \Leftrightarrow Sz \in \partial f(z) \Leftrightarrow$

$$f^*(Sz) + f(z) = \langle z, Sz \rangle = -\frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2.$$

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii): By (ii),

$$f^*(Sz) + f(z) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 = 0. \tag{19}$$

By Lemma 3.1,

$$f^*(Se) + \langle Sz - Se, e \rangle - f^*(Sz) \leq 0.$$

Adding above two equations yields

$$f^*(Se) + f(z) + \langle Sz - Se, e \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 \leq 0.$$

Since

$$f^*(Se) + f(z) \geq \langle Se, z \rangle,$$

by the Fenchel–Young inequality, and

$$\frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 = -\langle Sz, z \rangle,$$

we have

$$\langle Se, z \rangle + \langle Sz - Se, e \rangle - \langle Sz, z \rangle \leq 0,$$

from which

$$-\langle S(z - e), z - e \rangle = -\langle Sz - Se, z - e \rangle \leq 0.$$

Then  $\frac{1}{2}\|S(z - e)\|^2 \leq 0$ , so  $Sz = Se = d$ . Also, by Lemma 3.2 and  $\langle Se, e \rangle = -\frac{1}{2}\|Se\|^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2$ , we obtain

$$f^*(Sz) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 + \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) = 0. \tag{20}$$

Combining (19) and (20) gives  $f(z) = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e)$ .

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): Now (iii) ensures  $Sz = d = Se$  and  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(e) = f(z)$ . Also  $\langle Se, e \rangle = -\frac{1}{2}\|Se\|^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2$ . Then (11) in Lemma 3.2 gives

$$f^*(Sz) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 + f(z) = 0,$$

which is (ii).

(iii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iv): Assume that  $Sz = d = Se$ . Then  $z - e \in S^{-1}(0) = \text{Fix } R$ . Since  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})$  is translation-invariant with respect to  $Y^\perp = \text{Fix } R$  by Lemma 4.4(ii), we have  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(z) = \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(e)$ .  $\blacksquare$

To characterize classical cycles, we have to address conditions under which  $f(z) = \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(e)$  or  $f(z) = \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})(z)$ . These will be investigated in the next two subsections.

#### 4.1 Translation-invariant functions

**Lemma 4.7** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  and let  $C$  be a closed linear subspace of  $X$ . If  $f$  is translation-invariant with respect to  $C$ , then  $\text{dom } f^* \subseteq C^\perp$  and*

$$(f^* + \iota_{C^\perp})^* = \text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_C}) = f \square_{\iota_C} = f.$$

*Proof.* We can and will suppose  $C^\perp \neq X$ . Suppose  $v \notin C^\perp$ . Since  $C$  is a subspace, we can let  $u = P_C v$  such that  $\langle v, u \rangle = \langle v, P_C v \rangle = \|P_C v\|^2 > 0$ . Take  $x_0 \in \text{dom } f$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(v) &\geq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \langle v, x_0 + tu \rangle - f(x_0 + tu) \} \\ &= \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \langle v, x_0 \rangle - f(x_0) + t \langle v, u \rangle \} = +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\text{dom } f^* \subseteq C^\perp$ .

Next, since  $\text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$  and  $C^\perp$  is a closed subspace, we have  $\text{dom } f^* - C^\perp = C^\perp$ , so the Attouch–Brezis theorem [6, Theorem 15.3] gives  $(f^* + \iota_{C^\perp})^* = f \square_{\iota_C}$ , which implies  $f \square_{\iota_C}$  is lower semicontinuous, i.e.,  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_C}) = f \square_{\iota_C}$ . Because  $C$  is a subspace and  $f(x - u) = f(x)$  for  $-u \in C$ , we have

$$(\forall x \in X) (f \square_{\iota_C})(x) = \inf_{u \in C} f(x - u) = \inf_{-u \in C} f(x - u) = \inf_{-u \in C} f(x) = f(x).$$

$\blacksquare$

**Theorem 4.8** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  be translation-invariant with respect to  $\text{Fix } R$  and such that  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$  where  $Y = (\text{Fix } R)^\perp$ . Let  $d \in Y$  be given by Lemma 3.1. Then the following statements are equivalent for every  $z \in X$ :*

- (i)  $z = \text{Prox}_f Rz$ .

$$(ii) \quad f^*(Sz) + f(z) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 = 0.$$

$$(iii) \quad Sz = d.$$

*Proof.* In view of Theorem 4.6, it is clear that (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). It thus suffices to show that (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). By Lemma 4.7, we have

$$(f^* + \iota_Y)^* = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp}) = f \square \iota_{Y^\perp} = f \square \iota_{\text{Fix} R} = f. \quad (21)$$

Now (iii) ensures that  $Sz = d = Se$ , so that  $S(z - e) = 0$ . Then  $z - e \in \text{Fix} R$  and  $f(z) = f(e)$  by translation invariance. Using (21) yields

$$(f^* + \iota_Y)^*(e) = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) = (f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) = f(e) = f(z).$$

Now apply (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) from Theorem 4.6. ■

## 4.2 Minimizers

Our next result provides a sufficient condition under which the minimizers of  $f$  are cycles. More precisely,  $S^{-1}(d) \cap \text{argmin} f \subseteq \text{Fix}(\text{Prox}_f R)$  always holds.

**Lemma 4.9** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  with  $Y \cap \text{dom} f^* \neq \emptyset$  and let  $(e, d) \in Y \times Y$  be given by Lemma 3.1. Suppose in addition that  $Sz = d$  and  $z \in \text{argmin} f$ . Then*

$$z = \text{Prox}_f Rz, \quad \text{and} \quad (22)$$

$$\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(z) = \min \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp}) = f(z). \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.2, we have

$$f^*(Se) - \langle Se, e \rangle + \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) = 0. \quad (24)$$

Since  $\min f \leq \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp}) \leq f$ , we obtain

$$\min f = f(z) = \min \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp}) = \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(z). \quad (25)$$

Then, using  $Sz = d = Se$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq f^*(Sz) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 + f(z) = f^*(Se) + \frac{1}{2}\|Se\|^2 + f(z) \\ &= f^*(Se) - \langle Se, e \rangle + f(z) = -\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) + f(z) \\ &= -\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) + \min \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp}) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies

$$0 = f^*(Sz) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 + f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})(e) = f(z). \quad (26)$$

Hence, (22) follows from Theorem 4.6, and (23) follows from (25) and (26). ■

**Theorem 4.10** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  with  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$  and let  $d \in Y$  be given by Lemma 3.1. Then the following statements are equivalent for every  $z \in \text{argmin } f$ :*

- (i)  $z = \text{Prox}_f Rz$ .
- (ii)  $f^*(Sz) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 + f(z) = 0$ .
- (iii)  $Sz = d$ .

*Proof.* Combine Lemma 4.9 and Theorem 4.6. ■

Immediately we obtain the following result of Simons [11, Theorem 7].

**Corollary 4.11** *Let  $C$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$ . Let  $d \in Y$  be given by Lemma 3.1 with  $f = \iota_C$ . Then the following statements are equivalent for every  $z \in C$ :*

- (i)  $z = P_C Rz$ .
- (ii)  $\sigma_C(Sz) + \frac{1}{2}\|Sz\|^2 = 0$ .
- (iii)  $Sz = d$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $f^* = \sigma_C$  and  $0 \in Y \cap \text{dom } \sigma_C$ . Noting that  $C = \text{argmin } f$ , we observe that the result is clear from Theorem 4.10. ■

## 5 Phantom cycles and phantom gap vectors

The next result makes it clear that the classical cycles and gap vector of a function  $f$  are closely related to those of  $\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})$  and to which we refer as *phantom cycles* and *phantom gap vector*.

**Theorem 5.1** *Let  $f \in \Gamma_0(X)$  with  $Y \cap \text{dom } f^* \neq \emptyset$  and let  $(e, d) = (e_f, d_f)$  be given by Lemma 3.1. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *The set  $Z$  of phantom cycles of  $f$ , which are defined to be the set of classical cycles of the function  $\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})$ , i.e.,  $Z = \{z \in X \mid z = \text{Prox}_{\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})}(Rz)\}$ , is always nonempty and  $Z = e + Y^\perp$ . Consequently,  $Z$  contains infinitely many elements whenever  $Y^\perp = \text{Fix } R \neq \{0\}$ .*
- (ii) *The phantom gap vector of  $f$ , i.e., the gap vector  $d_{\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})}$ , is equal to  $d = Sz \in Y$  for every  $z \in Z$ ; moreover,  $e_{\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})} = e$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the function  $\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})$ . This function belongs to  $\Gamma_0(X)$ , and its Fenchel conjugate is  $f^* + \iota_Y$ . Moreover,  $\emptyset \neq Y \cap \text{dom } f^* = \text{dom } \iota_Y \cap \text{dom } f^* = \text{dom}(f^* + \iota_Y) = Y \cap \text{dom}[\text{cl}(f \square \iota_{Y^\perp})]^*$ .

We thus may and do apply Lemma 3.1 with  $f$  replaced by  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})$  to obtain the two “phantom” vectors  $(e', d') = (e_{\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})}, d_{\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})}) \in Y \times Y$ . Applying Lemma 3.2 to  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})$ , we learn that

$$\left( [\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})]^* + \iota_Y \right) (Se') + \left( \text{cl}([\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})] \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}) \right) (e') - \langle Se', e' \rangle = 0. \quad (27)$$

In view of  $[\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})]^* = f^* + \iota_Y$  and Corollary 4.5, we see that (27) simplifies to

$$f^*(Se') + (\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}))(e') - \langle Se', e' \rangle = 0. \quad (28)$$

Good news! Because  $e' \in Y$ , we deduce from the uniqueness assertion of Lemma 3.2 that  $e' = e$ . It follows that  $d' = Se' = Se = d$ . Theorem 4.8 applied to  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}})$  gives  $Z = S^{-1}d' = S^{-1}d = e + \ker S = e + \text{Fix } R = e + Y^\perp$ . Finally,  $(\forall z \in Z) Sz \in S(Z) = \{d'\} = \{d\}$  and we are done. ■

**Corollary 5.2** *Let  $C$  be a nonempty closed convex subset of  $X$ . Then the following hold:*

- (i) *The set of phantom cycles of  $\iota_C$ , i.e.,  $Z = \{z \in X \mid z = \text{Prox}_{\overline{\iota_C + Y^\perp}}(Rz)\}$ , is always nonempty and  $Z = e + Y^\perp$ , where  $e \in \overline{C + Y^\perp} \cap Y$  and  $\sigma_C(Se) - \langle Se, e \rangle = 0$ . Consequently,  $Z$  contains infinitely many elements as long as  $Y^\perp = \text{Fix } R \neq \{0\}$ .*
- (ii) *The unique phantom gap vector of  $\iota_C$  is  $d = Sz \in Y$  for every  $z \in Z$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $f = \iota_C$  and note that  $f^* = \sigma_C$  and  $0 \in Y \cap \text{dom } f^*$ . Moreover,  $\text{cl}(f \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}) = \text{cl}(\iota_C \square_{\iota_{Y^\perp}}) = \text{cl}(\iota_{C+Y^\perp}) = \iota_{\overline{C+Y^\perp}}$ . The conclusion thus follows from Theorem 5.1 and Lemma 3.2. ■

**Remark 5.3** Theorem 5.1 generalizes [3, Theorem 4.9], where only  $R : X^m \rightarrow X^m$  given by  $R(x_1, \dots, x_m) = (x_m, x_1, \dots, x_{m-1})$  is considered.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the referee for careful reading of the manuscript and valuable suggestions, which improved the exposition considerably. HHB and XW were supported by NSERC Discovery grants.

## References

- [1] S. Alwadani, H.H. Bauschke, J.P. Revalski, and X. Wang, The difference vectors for convex sets and a resolution of the geometry conjecture, *Open Journal of Mathematical Optimization* 2 (2021), article no. 5, 18 pages. <https://ojmo.centre-mersenne.org/articles/10.5802/ojmo.7/>

- [2] S. Alwadani, H.H. Bauschke, J.P. Revalski, and X. Wang, Resolvents and Yosida approximations of displacement mappings of isometries, *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis* 29 (2021), 721–733.
- [3] S. Alwadani, H.H. Bauschke, and X. Wang, Attouch–Théra duality, generalized cycles, and gap vectors, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 31 (2021), 1926–1946.
- [4] H. Attouch and M. Théra, A general duality principle for the sum of two operators, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 3 (1996), 1–24.
- [5] H.H. Bauschke, J.M. Borwein, and X. Wang, Fitzpatrick functions and continuous linear monotone operators, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 18 (2007), 789–809.
- [6] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, second edition, Springer, 2017.
- [7] H.H. Bauschke, X. Wang, and L. Yao, Monotone linear relations: maximality and Fitzpatrick functions, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 16 (2009), 673–686.
- [8] N. Higham, *p*th roots of matrices, talk, 2009, <https://www.maths.manchester.ac.uk/~higham/talks/talk>
- [9] E. Kreyszig, *Introductory Functional Analysis with Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1989.
- [10] R.T. Rockafellar, On the maximality of sums of nonlinear monotone operators, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 149 (1970), 75–88.
- [11] S. Simons, *m*th roots of the identity operator and the geometry conjecture, to appear in *Proceedings of the AMS*. Preprint version available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2112.09805.pdf>
- [12] S. Simons, *From Hahn-Banach to Monotonicity*, Springer-Verlag, 2008.