

EXPLICIT EXPRESSIONS AND COMPUTATIONAL METHODS FOR THE FORTET-MOURIER DISTANCE TO FINITE WEIGHTED SUMS OF DIRAC MEASURES

SANDER C. HILLE AND ESMÉE S. THEEWS

ABSTRACT. Explicit expressions and computational approaches are given for the Fortet-Mourier distance between a positively weighted sum of Dirac measures on a metric space and a positive finite Borel measure. Explicit expressions are given for the distance to a single Dirac measure. For the case of a sum of several Dirac measures one needs to resort to a computational approach. In particular, two algorithms are given to compute the Fortet-Mourier norm of a molecular measure, i.e. a finite weighted sum of Dirac measures. It is discussed how one of these can be modified to allow computation of the dual bounded Lipschitz (or Dudley) norm of such measures.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (S, d) be a metric space and $\mathcal{B}(S)$ the Borel σ -algebra on S . Let $\mathcal{M}(S)$ denote the set of finite Borel measures on S , and $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ the set of positive finite Borel measures on S . Let $\mathcal{BL}(S)$ denote the set of bounded Lipschitz functions on S , i.e. functions $f: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq Ld(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in S$. For $f \in \mathcal{BL}(S)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$ we define the Fortet-Mourier norm of μ as

$$(1) \quad \|\mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* := \sup \left\{ \langle \mu, f \rangle : f \in \mathcal{BL}(S), \|f\|_\infty \leq 1, |f|_L \leq 1 \right\}, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(S),$$

$$\langle \mu, f \rangle := \int_S f d\mu.$$

$$(2) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i} - \mu \right\|_{\text{FM}}^*, \quad N \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha_i > 0, x_i \in S \text{ and } \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S).$$

Here δ_x is the Dirac measure at $x \in S$ and $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ is the set of positive finite Borel measures on S .

For a detailed introduction to the Fortet-Mourier norm and its applications see [1, 2, 10], [3, 20, 31] or [9, 32]. For a detailed introduction to the Dudley norm and its applications see [13, 23, 27] or [6]. For a detailed introduction to the Dudley norm and its applications see [13, 22].

Date: July 11, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 28A33, 46E27, 90C05, 90C25.

Key words and phrases. Fortet-Mourier norm, Borel measure, metric space, linear and convex optimization.

Integrability
 [5, 30] If μ is a
 finite Borel measure
 on S , then μ is
 integrable if and only if
 [1] $\int_S f d\mu < \infty$
 [20] μ

Integrability (2) of f
 Integrability
 of f is equivalent to
 the finiteness of the
 integral $\int_S f d\mu$

μ

Let $N(2)$ be the
 set of functions f on
 S such that $\int_S f d\mu < \infty$
 [1, 15] $N(2)$

L^p -norm ($p > 1$). $N(2)$

Integrability

Integrability

Integrability

See [2] for details

Integrability (2) of f

is

Integrability

Integrability

Integrability (2) of f

μ

$$(3) \quad \|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^*, \quad \tau \in \text{Mol}(S) := \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_x : x \in S \rangle,$$

where

molecular measures [9]

Integrability of f

Integrability of f

Let $\tau \in \text{Mol}(S)$ and $S = \mathbb{R}\langle \delta_x : x \in S \rangle$

$\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^*$

([8] Appendix B)

Integrability

\mathbb{R} . $\langle \delta_x \rangle$

Integrability of f

et al. [4]

Integrability of f

Integrability

$$\tau = \nu - \mu \quad \nu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}$$

μ ,

Integrability ([4] B.3, p1557). $\mathbb{R}\langle \delta_x : x \in S \rangle$

Integrability of f

S , $N(2)$

Integrability

$S, d, N(2)$

Integrability

$$(4) \quad \|\delta_x - \delta_y\|_{\text{FM}}^* = 2 \wedge d(x, y), \quad x, y \in S$$

(eg [3, 29]). $\mathbb{R}\langle \delta_x : x \in S \rangle$

Integrability

$$(5) \quad \|\delta_x - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \langle \mu, 2 \wedge d(x, \cdot) \rangle, \quad x \in S, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(S),$$

Proposition (2) iv $\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^*$
 61. 65 idfjn
 for $\tau \in \text{Mol}(S)$. In S τ is
 64] 66
 65 of D
 64] τ

1.1. Preliminary results and notation. For $(S, d) \in \text{BL}(S)$ τ
 S , τ

For

$$f \in \text{BL}(S),$$

$$|f|_L := \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{d(x, y)} : x, y \in S, x \neq y \right\}$$

66

f. τ

$$|f|_{L, S} \text{ for } \tau$$

BL(S)

S) τ

and τ is τ

in $f \vee g$ τ

$f \wedge g$ τ

$f, g \in \text{BL}(S)$ τ

in

$$(f \vee g)(x) = \max(f(x), g(x)), \quad (f \wedge g)(x) = \min(f(x), g(x)), \quad x \in S.$$

6

$$|f \vee g|_L \leq \max(|f|_L, |g|_L) \quad \text{and} \quad |f \wedge g|_L \leq \max(|f|_L, |g|_L),$$

eg [7] τ

$$\|f\|_{\text{FM}} := \max(\|f\|_\infty, |f|_L) \in \text{BL}(S), \tau$$

BL(S) τ

S) τ

B_{FM}^S .

66

B_{FM}^S τ

66

Lemma 1.1. *Let (S, d) be a metric space. The following statements hold:*

(i) *Let $g \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $x_i \in S$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$). Define*

$$(8) \quad h := (-1) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (g(x_i) - d(x_i, \cdot)).$$

Then $h \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$, $h \leq g$ and $h(x_i) = g(x_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

(ii) *Let $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ be a subset of S of distinct points, equipped with the restriction of the metric on S . If $g \in B_{\text{FM}}^P$, then h defined by (8) is in B_{FM}^S and satisfies $h(x_i) = g(x_i)$ for all i . Moreover, $|h|_{L, S} \leq |g|_{L, P}$.*

Proof. (i). τ

$$x \mapsto g(x_i) - d(x_i, x) \text{ in } S$$

S τ

61 τ , τ

$$\|g\|_\infty \leq 1. \text{ Hence } -1 \leq h \leq 1 \text{ and } |h|_L \leq 1.$$

$h \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$. For τ

$$h \leq g. \text{ For } x \in S, \text{ we have } h(x) = -1 \vee$$

$h(x) = g(x_i) - d(x_i, x)$ for

$i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. In fact, τ

$$h(x) =$$

$-1 \leq -\|g\|_\infty \leq g(x)$. In fact, τ

$$g(x_i) - g(x) \leq |g|_L d(x_i, x) \leq d(x_i, x). \text{ So}$$

$h(x) = g(x_i) - d(x_i, x) \leq g(x)$. τ

$$h \text{ is } i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$$

$h(x_i) \geq g(x_i) - d(x_i, x_i) = g(x_i)$. τ $h(x_i) = g(x_i)$.

(ii). For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$, $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$, $\mu \leq \nu$ implies $\mu \leq \nu$. □

Lemma 1.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i + b_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$,
- (ii) $|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i - \sum_{i=1}^n b_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - b_i|$.

Proof. For (i) is obvious. For (ii), let $a_j = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ and $b_j = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$. □

$$|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i - \sum_{i=1}^n b_i| = |a_j - b_j| \leq |a_j - b_j| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i - b_i|.$$

For (S, d) , $\mathcal{M}(S)$ is a BL-algebra. For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$, $\mu \leq \nu$ implies $\mu \leq \nu$. □

$$I_\mu(f) := \int_S f d\mu =: \langle \mu, f \rangle, \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}(S), f \in \text{BL}(S).$$

For $\mu \mapsto I_\mu$ is a linear map from $\mathcal{M}(S)$ to $\mathcal{L}(C, \mathbb{R})$. For $C \subset S$ and $f_n := \sum_{i=1}^n f_i$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$ implies $\mu \leq \nu$ implies $\mu \leq \nu$. □

2. DIMENSIONAL REDUCTION FOR DETERMINING THE DEFINING SUPREMUM

Let (S, d) be a metric space. For $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(S)$, $\nu \leq \nu$ implies $\nu \leq \nu$. □

Theorem 2.1. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ with $P := \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, with the x_i all distinct. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. Then

$$(9) \quad \|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \sup_{f \in B_{\text{FM}}^P} \langle \nu - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (f(x_i) - d(x_i, \cdot)) \rangle$$

$$(10) \quad = \sup_{\theta \in [-1, 1]^N} \langle \nu - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\theta_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) \rangle.$$

Proof. First $\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \sup_{g \in B_{\text{FM}}^S} \langle \nu - \mu, g \rangle$. If $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$, $\alpha_i > 0$.
 Let $g \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$. Note $P, g|_P$, in B_{FM}^P and $g(x_i) = g|_P(x_i)$ for
 $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Define

$$(11) \quad h := (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (g(x_i) - d(x_i, \cdot)).$$

By Lemma 1.1, $h \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$, $h \leq g$ and $h(x_i) = g(x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

$$(12) \quad \langle \nu - \mu, h \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i g(x_i) - \langle \mu, h \rangle \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i g(x_i) - \langle \mu, g \rangle = \langle \nu - \mu, g \rangle.$$

By (9), $h \leq g$ implies $\langle \nu - \mu, h \rangle \leq \langle \nu - \mu, g \rangle$.
 Let $f \in B_{\text{FM}}^P$. Define $h := (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (f(x_i) - d(x_i, \cdot))$.
 In B_{FM}^S (Lemma 1.1) (ii).

From (10), $\theta \in [-1, 1]^N$ and

$$(13) \quad h_\theta(x) := (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\theta_i - d(x_i, x)), \quad x \in S.$$

By Lemma 1.1, $-1 \leq h_\theta \leq 1$. If $|h_\theta|_L \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} (|-\mathbb{1}|_L, |\theta_i - d(x_i, \cdot)|_L) = 1$. If
 $h_\theta \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$. So \geq (10). For \leq : let $f \in B_{\text{FM}}^P$ and

$$g(x) := (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (f(x_i) - d(x_i, x))$$

By Lemma 1.1 (ii), $g \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$ and $g(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $\theta_i \in [-1, 1]$ and $h_\theta \geq g$. Step (10) is satisfied.
 In (9). Hence \leq . \square

From (9) and (10) it follows that $h_\theta(x_i) \geq \theta_i$ for
 $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $h_\theta \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$. If $g \in B_{\text{FM}}^P$, then $h_\theta \geq g$ and
 in (9), $h_\theta(x_i) = g(x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

If $\nu \neq \mu$, then $\nu \neq \mu$ implies
 in (10) $\nu \neq \mu$ and
 in

Proposition 2.1. Let $\nu \in \text{Mol}^+(S) \cap \mathcal{P}(S)$, with $\text{supp}(\nu) = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, all $x_i \in S$ distinct,
 and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$. Then

$$(14) \quad \|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \sup \left\{ \langle \nu - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\theta_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) \rangle : \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N \in [-1, 1], \max_i (\theta_i) = 1 \right\}.$$

Proof. By (10), step (14) is

in (10). For the \geq part, let $g \in B_{\text{FM}}^S$. Let $\varepsilon := \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} (1 - g(x_i)) \geq 0$ and $\theta_i := g(x_i) + \varepsilon$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Then

Let $\varepsilon = 1 - g(x_k)$. If $\theta_k = 1$, then $\theta_i(\theta_i) = 1$. If $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)$ and h_θ is defined by (13),

$$(15) \quad h_\theta(x_i) \geq \theta_i - d(x_i, x_i) = g(x_i) + \varepsilon.$$

If $h_\theta \leq g + \varepsilon$. If $x \in S$ and $h_\theta(x) = -1$, then $g \geq -1$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$. If $h_\theta(x) > -1$, then $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} h_\theta(x) &= \theta_j - d(x_j, x) = g(x_j) + \varepsilon - d(x_j, x) = g(x) + \varepsilon - d(x_j, x) + g(x_j) - g(x) \\ &\leq g(x) + \varepsilon - d(x_j, x) + d(x_j, x) = g(x) + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

Let $g \in B_{FM}^S$ and $|g|_L \leq 1$. If $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$, with $\alpha_i > 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu - \mu, h_\theta \rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i h(x_i) - \int_S h_\theta d\mu \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i (g(x_i) + \varepsilon) - \int_S (g + \varepsilon) d\mu \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i g(x_i) + \varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i - \int_S g d\mu - \varepsilon \mu(S) = \langle \nu - \mu, g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\|\nu - \mu\|_{FM}^* = \inf_{g \in B_{FM}^S} \langle \nu - \mu, g \rangle$, then (14). □

3. EXPLICIT EXPRESSIONS FOR THE DISTANCE TO A SINGLE POINT MASS

3.1. EXPLICIT EXPRESSIONS FOR THE DISTANCE TO A SINGLE POINT MASS

Let $x \in S$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$.

Let δ_x be the Dirac measure at x .

Let $\mathbb{1}$ be the constant function 1.

Let $d(x, \cdot)$ be the distance function.

Let $2 \wedge d(x, \cdot)$ be the function $\min(2, d(x, \cdot))$.

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$.

$$\|\alpha \delta_x - \mu\|_{FM}^*, \quad x \in S, \alpha > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S).$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let $x \in S$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$. Then*

$$\|\delta_x - \mu\|_{FM}^* = \langle \delta_x - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee (1 - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle = \langle \mu, 2 \wedge d(x, \cdot) \rangle.$$

Proof. Let $N = 1$.

Let

$$(17) \quad (-\mathbb{1}) \vee (1 - d(x, \cdot)) = -(\mathbb{1} \wedge (d(x, \cdot) - 1)) = -(2 \wedge d(x, \cdot)) + \mathbb{1}.$$

Let $\delta_x - \mu$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$. □

Example 3.1. 1.) Applying Proposition 3.1 in the special case $\mu = \delta_y$ yields the well-known expression $\|\delta_x - \delta_y\|_{FM}^* = 2 \wedge d(x, y)$, shown in (4).

2.) If $\mu = \alpha \delta_{y_1} + (1 - \alpha) \delta_{y_2}$ with $y_1, y_2 \in S$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, then Proposition 3.1 gives the explicit expression

$$(18) \quad \|\delta_x - \alpha \delta_{y_1} - (1 - \alpha) \delta_{y_2}\|_{FM}^* = \alpha(2 \wedge d(x, y_1)) + (1 - \alpha)(2 \wedge d(x, y_2)).$$

3.) Let $S = [0, 1]$, equipped with the Euclidean metric and let λ be the Borel-Lebesgue measure on S , $\lambda([0, 1]) = 1$. Then for any $x \in S$,

$$(19) \quad \|\delta_x - \lambda\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \int_0^1 2 \wedge |x - y| dy = \int_0^x (x - y) dy + \int_x^1 (y - x) dy = \frac{1}{2} - x + x^2.$$

Notice that expression (19) is minimal for $x = 1/2$ with value $1/4$. Thus, there exists a (unique) best approximation in $\mathcal{P}(S)$ of λ by a single Dirac measure in Fortet-Mourier:

$$(20) \quad \inf_{x \in S} \|\delta_x - \lambda\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \|\delta_{1/2} - \lambda\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \frac{1}{4}.$$

The location of best approximation is in this case the median of the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, which is given by λ .

4.) Let S be as in part 3.) and $f \geq 0$ a probability distribution function. Then

$$\|\delta_x - f d\lambda\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \int_0^1 |x - y| f(y) dy = \int_0^x (x - y) f(y) dy - \int_x^1 (y - x) f(y) dy.$$

For specific f the latter expression can be computed, in principle.

Proposition 3.1. It holds

$$\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S):$$

Corollary 3.1. Let $x \in S$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. Then

$$\|\delta_x - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \inf_{\theta \in [-1, 1]} \langle \delta_x - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee (\theta - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle.$$

Proposition 3.1 $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ holds $\theta = 1$.

Let $B(x, r) := \{y \in S : d(x, y) < r\}$ denote the ball in (S, d) of radius r , then x . In $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ $(x, r) \mapsto \mu(B(x, r))$ is increasing.

Theorem 3.1. Let $x \in S$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. Then

$$\|\delta_x - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \langle \delta_x - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee (\theta_0 - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle,$$

where $\theta_0 = \theta_0(x) := (2 \wedge \inf \{r \geq 0 : \mu(B(x, r)) \geq 1\}) - 1 \in [-1, 1]$.

(which holds $\theta = +\infty$).

Proof. Define $\phi(\theta) := \langle \delta_x - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee (\theta - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle$. Then ϕ is linear on $[-1, 1]$. Let $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in [-1, 1]$ with $\theta > \tilde{\theta}$. If

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\theta) - \phi(\tilde{\theta}) &= \theta - \int_{B(x, \theta+1)} \theta - d(x, y) d\mu(y) - \int_{S \setminus B(x, \theta+1)} -\mathbb{1} d\mu \\ &\quad - \tilde{\theta} + \int_{B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)} \tilde{\theta} - d(x, y) d\mu(y) + \int_{S \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)} -\mathbb{1} d\mu \\ &= (\theta - \tilde{\theta})(1 - \mu(B(x, \tilde{\theta} + 1))) - \int_{B(x, \theta+1) \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)} \theta - d(x, y) + 1 d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(21) \quad \int_{S \setminus B(x, \theta+1)} \mathbb{1} d\mu - \int_{S \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)} \mathbb{1} d\mu = -[\mu(B(x, \theta+1)) - \mu(B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1))]$$

$$(22) \quad = -\mu(B(x, \theta+1) \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)).$$

If $\phi(\theta) > \phi(\tilde{\theta})$ then

$$(23) \quad (\theta - \tilde{\theta})(1 - \mu(B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1))) > \int_{B(x, \theta+1) \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)} \theta - d(x, y) + 1 d\mu(y).$$

If $\tilde{\theta} \mapsto \mu(B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1))$ is a μ -spanned $\theta_0, \mu(B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)) \geq 1$ then $\tilde{\theta} > \theta_0$. In this case

the function ϕ is non-increasing on $(\theta_0, 1]$ (If $\theta_0 = 1$, then $(\theta_0, 1] = \emptyset$)

we have $\phi \in [-1, \theta_0)$. If $\theta_0 = -1$, then $(-1, \theta_0) = \emptyset$ and $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in [-1, \theta_0)$, $\theta > \tilde{\theta}$. For $y \in B(x, \theta+1) \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)$ we have $d(x, y) \geq \tilde{\theta}+1$, so $\theta - \tilde{\theta} \geq \theta - d(x, y) + 1$.

$$(24) \quad (\theta - \tilde{\theta})(1 - \mu(B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1))) > \int_{B(x, \theta+1) \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)} \theta - \tilde{\theta} d\mu(y)$$

is a contradiction. If $\theta > \tilde{\theta}$, then (24) holds

$$1 - \mu(B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)) > \mu(B(x, \theta+1) \setminus B(x, \tilde{\theta}+1)),$$

which

$$(25) \quad \mu(B(x, \theta+1)) < 1.$$

If (25) holds then $\phi(\theta) > \phi(\tilde{\theta})$. By (25) we have $\theta < \theta_0$. If $\phi \in [-1, \theta_0)$.

By (25) we have $\phi \in [-1, 1] \cap (-1, \theta_0)$ and $\theta_0, 1]$. \square

Remark 3.1. Paradoxically, in the special case that $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$, Proposition 3.1 claims that the value of the norm $\|\delta_x - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^*$ can be obtained by taking $\theta = 1$, instead of $\theta = \theta_0$, which is possibly less than 1. However, the proof of Proposition 3.1 shows that the minimum value for θ at which the maximum of the function ϕ is attained, which equals the stated Fortet-Mourier norm, is θ_0 . Since ϕ is non-increasing on $(\theta_0, 1]$, there must exist also a maximum value at which this (same) maximum value is attained, say θ_1 . In case μ is a probability measure, Proposition 3.1 shows that $\theta_1 = 1$. So there is no contradiction between the result of Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.1.

Let us prove

Corollary 3.2. Let $x \in S$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ with $\mu(S) < 1$. Then $\theta_0 = 1$ and

$$\|\delta_x - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \langle \delta_x - \mu, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee (1 - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle = 1 - \mu(S) + \langle \mu, 2 \wedge d(x, \cdot) \rangle.$$

Corollary 3.3. *Let $x \in S$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. Then*

$$\|\alpha\delta_x - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \langle \alpha\delta_x - \mu, (-\mathbf{1}) \vee (\theta_0^\alpha - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle = \alpha\theta_0^\alpha - \langle \mu, (-\mathbf{1}) \vee (\theta_0^\alpha - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle,$$

where $\theta_0^\alpha = \theta_0^\alpha(x) = 2 \wedge \mathbf{f} \{r \geq 0 : \mu(B(x, r)) \geq \alpha\} - 1 \in [-1, 1]$.

Proof. $\|\alpha\delta_x - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \alpha\|\delta_x - \alpha^{-1}\mu\|_{\text{FM}}^*$. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let $x, y \in S$ and $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Then*

$$(26) \quad \|\alpha\delta_x - \beta\delta_y\|_{\text{FM}}^* = |\alpha - \beta| + (\alpha \wedge \beta)(2 \wedge d(x, y)).$$

Proof. $\|\alpha\delta_x - \beta\delta_y\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \alpha\theta_0^\alpha - \beta((-\mathbf{1}) \vee (\theta_0^\alpha - d(x, y)))$,

$$(27) \quad \theta_0^\alpha = (2 \wedge \mathbf{f} \{r \geq 0 : \delta_y(B(x, r)) \geq \alpha/\beta\}) - 1 \in [-1, 1]$$

$\{r \geq 0 : \delta_y(B(x, r)) \geq \alpha/\beta\} = \begin{cases} \{r : r > d(x, y)\}, & \mathbf{f} \alpha/\beta \leq 1, \\ \emptyset, & \mathbf{f} \alpha/\beta > 1. \end{cases}$

$\theta_0^\alpha = \begin{cases} d(x, y) - 1, & \mathbf{f} \alpha \leq \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) < 2, \\ 1, & \mathbf{f} \alpha > \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) \geq 2. \end{cases}$

$\|\alpha\delta_x - \beta\delta_y\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \begin{cases} \alpha(d(x, y) - 1) + \beta, & \mathbf{f} \alpha \leq \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) < 2, \\ \alpha - \beta((-\mathbf{1}) \vee 1 - d(x, y)), & \mathbf{f} \alpha > \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) \geq 2, \end{cases}$

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} &= \begin{cases} \beta - \alpha + \alpha d(x, y), & \mathbf{f} \alpha \leq \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) < 2, \\ \alpha - \beta(1 - 2 \wedge d(x, y)), & \mathbf{f} \alpha > \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) \geq 2, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} |\alpha - \beta| + \alpha d(x, y), & \mathbf{f} \alpha \leq \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) < 2, \\ \alpha - \beta + \beta(2 \wedge d(x, y)), & \mathbf{f} \alpha > \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) \geq 2, \end{cases} \\ &= |\alpha - \beta| + (\alpha \wedge \beta)(2 \wedge d(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

$\alpha \wedge \beta = \alpha + \beta - |\alpha - \beta|$.

$\alpha \leq \beta \ \mathbf{d} \ d(x, y) \geq 2$, \square

Remark 3.2. *Without the use of the results that we presented, one could estimate as follows. Put $z := x$ if $\alpha \geq \beta$ and $z := y$ if $\alpha < \beta$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\delta_x - \beta\delta_y\|_{\text{FM}}^* &= \|(\alpha \wedge \beta)(\delta_x - \delta_y) + |\alpha - \beta|\delta_z\|_{\text{FM}}^* \\ &\leq (\alpha \wedge \beta)\|\delta_x - \delta_y\|_F M^* + |\alpha - \beta|\|\delta_z\|_{\text{FM}}^* \\ &= (\alpha \wedge \beta)(2 \wedge d(x, y)) + |\alpha - \beta|. \end{aligned}$$

The point of Corollary 3.4 is, that equality holds.

with $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$, $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ with $\alpha_i > 0$ and $x_i \in S$.

4. DISTANCE TO POSITIVE MOLECULAR MEASURES – AN ALGORITHMIC APPROACH

Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. We define the Fortet-Mourier distance between ν and μ as

$$\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \inf_{\nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}} \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i d(x_i, \cdot)$$

where the infimum is taken over all representations of ν as a sum of Dirac measures. It is known that $\|\cdot\|_{\text{FM}}^*$ is a norm on $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ and that $\|\cdot\|_{\text{FM}}^*$ is equivalent to the total variation norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ on $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ (see [14, §4]).

Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. We define the Fortet-Mourier distance between ν and μ as $\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \inf_{\nu = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}} \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i d(x_i, \cdot)$ where the infimum is taken over all representations of ν as a sum of Dirac measures. It is known that $\|\cdot\|_{\text{FM}}^*$ is a norm on $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ and that $\|\cdot\|_{\text{FM}}^*$ is equivalent to the total variation norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ on $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ (see [14, §4]).

$$|\iota(f)_j - \iota(g)_j| \leq \|f - g\|_{\infty} \leq \|f - g\|_{\text{FM}},$$

where $\iota : B_{\text{FM}}^P \rightarrow [-1, 1]^N$ is defined by $\iota(f) := (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_N))$.

$$(29) \quad \psi_{\tau} : [-1, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \theta \mapsto \langle \tau, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\theta_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) \rangle.$$

Lemma 4.1:

$$(30) \quad \|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \inf_{\theta \in [-1, 1]^N} \psi_{\nu - \mu}(\theta) = \inf_{f \in B_{\text{FM}}^P} \psi_{\nu - \mu}(\iota(f)).$$

Proposition 4.1. *If $[-1, 1]^N$ is equipped with the \mathfrak{m} -distance or the Euclidean metric, then ψ_{τ} is Lipschitz continuous and $|\psi_{\tau}|_L \leq \|\tau\|_{\text{TV}}$. For $\tau \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$, ψ_{τ} is convex on $[-1, 1]^N$.*

Proof. Let $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in [-1, 1]^N$. By (13), Lemma 4.2 (ii), and the definition of ψ_{τ} ,

$$(31) \quad |h_{\theta}(x) - h_{\tilde{\theta}}(x)| \leq \mathfrak{m}_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\theta_i - \tilde{\theta}_i|.$$

Let

$$\tau \in \mathcal{M}(S),$$

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} |\psi_{\tau}(\theta) - \psi_{\tau}(\tilde{\theta})| &= |\langle \tau, h_{\theta} - h_{\tilde{\theta}} \rangle| \leq \|\tau\|_{\text{TV}} \|h_{\theta} - h_{\tilde{\theta}}\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \|\tau\|_{\text{TV}} \mathfrak{m}_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\theta_i - \tilde{\theta}_i| \leq \|\tau\|_{\text{TV}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N |\theta_i - \tilde{\theta}_i|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\psi_{\tau} \text{ is Lipschitz continuous with } |\psi_{\tau}|_L \leq \|\tau\|_{\text{TV}}.$$

Let $\tau \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. Let $\theta, \tilde{\theta} \in [-1, 1]^N$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1$. **Lemma 4.2**
(ii) **Proposition 4.2**

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\tau(t\theta + (1-t)\tilde{\theta}) &= \langle \tau, (-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (t(\theta_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) + (1-t)(\tilde{\theta}_i - d(x_i, \cdot))) \rangle \\ (33) \quad &\leq \langle \tau, (t(-\mathbb{1}) + (1-t)(-\mathbb{1})) \vee \left(t \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\theta_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) + (1-t) \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\tilde{\theta}_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) \right) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (34) \quad &\leq \langle \tau, t \left((-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\theta_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) \right) + (1-t) \left((-\mathbb{1}) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^N (\tilde{\theta}_i - d(x_i, \cdot)) \right) \rangle \\ &= t\psi_\tau(\theta) + (1-t)\psi_\tau(\tilde{\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

ψ_τ is concave on $[-1, 1]^N$. \square

By $\psi_{\nu-\mu}$ is concave on $[-1, 1]^N$ and $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$.

For τ, ψ_τ is concave on $[-1, 1]^N$ and $\psi_{\tau+}$ and $\psi_{\tau-}$.
Lemma 4.2 ψ_τ is concave on $[-1, 1]^N$ and $\tau = \nu - \mu$.

Proposition 4.2. Let $\nu \in \text{Mol}^+(S)$ with $P := \text{supp}(\nu) = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$. Then ψ_ν is ‘linear’ on $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P) \subset [-1, 1]^N$. In particular, $\psi_{\nu-\mu} = \psi_\nu - \psi_\mu$ is concave.

Proof. **Proposition 4.2** $\psi_{\nu-\mu} = \psi_\nu - \psi_\mu$. ψ_μ is concave on $[-1, 1]^N$, **Proposition 4.1**,
 ψ_ν is concave on $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$. For $\theta \in [-1, 1]^N$ and $h_\theta(x_i) \geq \theta_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. **Proposition 4.2** $\theta \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$ is
 $f \in B_{\text{FM}}^P$ and $\theta = \iota(f)$. **Proposition 4.1** (ii), $h_\theta(x_i) = f(x_i)$ for
 $i \in P$ and $f \in B_{\text{FM}}^P$, $f_i = \iota(f)_i = f(x_i)$.

$$(35) \quad \psi_\nu(\iota(f)) = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}, h_{\iota(f)} \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i f_i.$$

ψ_ν is linear on $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$ and \mathbb{R}^N is $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$.
Proposition 4.2 ψ_ν is concave on $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$. \square

Proposition 4.2 $\psi_{\nu-\mu}$ is concave on $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$.
Proposition 4.2 $\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* < \infty$ and $\nu \in \text{Mol}^+(S)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ is concave
in \mathbb{R}^N , $P = \text{supp}(\nu) \subset S$, $\psi_{\nu-\mu}$ is concave on $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$.
Proposition 4.2 $\psi_{\nu-\mu}$ is concave on $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$.

Proposition 4.2 (g 6, 9, 33) **Proposition 4.2**
Proposition 4.2 **Proposition 4.2**
Proposition 4.2 **Proposition 4.2**
(9) **Proposition 4.2**

‘With only a bit of exaggeration, we can say that, if you formulate a practical problem as a convex optimization problem, then you have solved the original problem.’

Remark 4.6. For any $\nu \in \text{Mol}^+(S)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ we have $\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \psi_{\nu - \mu}$.

Corollary 4.7. For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(S)$ and ψ_μ (in \mathbb{R}^n) we have $\|\mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \psi_\mu$ if and only if $\mu \in \text{Mol}^+(S)$, i.e. $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$.

Example 4.1. Let $S = (0, \infty)$, equipped with the Euclidean metric and take

$$\mu := e^{-x^2} dx, \quad \nu := \frac{1}{2}\delta_0 + 2\delta_{\frac{1}{3}} + \frac{1}{5}\delta_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{3}\delta_3.$$

We implemented an algorithm to minimize $-\psi_{\nu - \mu}$ over $\iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$, with $P = \{0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, 3\}$, using the MATLAB ‘fmincon’ function, see Appendix A.1. It resulted in

$$\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}^* = -(-\psi_{\nu - \mu}(f)) \approx 2.3921\dots, \quad \text{with } f = [1, 1, \frac{5}{6}, 1].$$

5. COMPUTING THE FORTET-MOURIER NORM OF A MOLECULAR MEASURE

Proposition 5.1. Let $S = \mathbb{R}$ and $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ be a molecular measure. Then $\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \|\tau\|_{\text{TV}} = \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|$ if $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ and $\tau^+ \neq 0$.

As a consequence, for any S, d and $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset S$, we have $\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|$ if $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ and $d_{ij} := d(x_i, x_j)$. Its proof is given in [24] (see [8] Appendix B.4).

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P) &= \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{f \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f_k| \leq 1\} \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \{f \in \mathbb{R}^n : |f_i - f_j| d_{ij}^{-1} \leq 1\} \\ (36) \quad &= \bigcap_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{f_k \leq 1\} \cap \{-f_k \leq 1\} \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \{(f_i - f_j) d_{ij}^{-1} \leq 1\} \cap \{(f_j - f_i) d_{ij}^{-1} \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Eq.(36) is in fact a hypercube (see [7]).

Fig. 1. For any $P \subset S$ we have $B_{\text{FM}}^P = \{ \tau = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i} : \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}, x_i \in S, P := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \}$.
Lemma 1. (i) $B_{\text{FM}}^S = B_{\text{FM}}^P$ if and only if $P = S$.




FIGURE 1. The unit ball B_{FM}^P for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{FM}}$ on the space $\text{BL}(P, d)$, where $P = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $f \in \text{BL}(P, d)$ is represented by $(f_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $f_i := f(x_i)$. The defining conditions are given by (36). The metric d is defined by $d_{ij} := d(x_i, x_j)$ and differs for the two cases shown. Left: $d_{12} = 1$, $d_{13} = 2$, $d_{23} = 3$. Right: $d_{12} = 0.75$, $d_{13} = 1$, $d_{23} = 1.25$.

¶

$$(37) \quad \|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \inf_{g \in B_{\text{FM}}^S} \langle \tau, g \rangle = \inf_{f \in B_{\text{FM}}^P} \langle \tau|_P, f \rangle = \min_{f \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i f_i.$$

¶ $\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^*$ can be computed

using the MATLAB function

`linprog`, using (36). In the

simple case $\alpha_i \geq 0$

the optimum is attained at $(1, \dots, 1)$ if

$\sum_i \alpha_i < 0$, at $(-1, \dots, -1)$.

¶ B_{FM}^P is a polytope

¶

`linprog`,

$$\sum_i \alpha_i \geq 0$$

Example 5.1. Let $P = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $d_{12} = 1$, $d_{13} = 2$ and $d_{23} = 3$. Notice that the prescribed distances are consistent with the triangle inequality. Take $\alpha_1 = 1$, $\alpha_2 = -\frac{1}{3}$ and $\alpha_3 = -\frac{2}{3}$. Equation (18) gives an explicit result in this case:

$$\left\| \sum_i \alpha_i \delta_{x_i} \right\|_{\text{FM}}^* = |\alpha_2|(2 \wedge d_{12}) + (1 - |\alpha_2|)(2 \wedge d_{13}) = \frac{1}{3} \cdot 1 + \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2 = \frac{5}{3}.$$

We implemented an algorithm for computing the Fortet-Mourier norms of molecular measures in MATLAB, using the ‘`linprog`’ algorithm, see Appendix A.2. It returned the same result for the norm, but also an f at which the optimum is attained. In this case $f = (1, 0, -1)$.

This f corresponds precisely to the function $(-1) \vee (1 - d(x_1, \cdot))$ that appears in the theoretical result, Proposition 3.1.

Let $\tau \in \text{Mol}(S)$ be a signed measure on \mathbb{R}^n with total mass 0 and support P . Then τ^+ and τ^- are positive measures with total mass $n/2$. We assume $N \leq n/2$ and $\nu = \tau^-$ is supported on $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$. Then $\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \|\tau^-\|_{\text{FM}}^*$.

$$\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \|\tau^-\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \max_{f \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)} \psi_{-\tau}(f) = - \min_{f \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)} (-\psi_{-\tau}(f)),$$

(30) Let $\theta \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$. Then $\psi_{-\tau}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \theta_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n-N} \beta_j ((-1) \vee \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} (\theta_i - d(x_i, y_j)))$. If $N \leq n/2$, then $\psi_{-\tau}(\theta) = \langle \mu, \theta \rangle$ for $\mu \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$.

$$\tau = \sum_{j=1}^{n-N} \beta_j \delta_{y_j} - \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}, \quad \alpha_i, \beta_j > 0,$$

Let $\theta \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$

$$(38) \quad \psi_{-\tau}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \theta_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n-N} \beta_j ((-1) \vee \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} (\theta_i - d(x_i, y_j))).$$

Since $\psi_{-\tau}(\theta) = \langle \mu, \theta \rangle$ for $\mu \in \iota(B_{\text{FM}}^P)$, we have $\|\tau\|_{\text{FM}}^* = \|\mu\|_{\text{BL}}^*$.

6. COMPUTING DUDLEY NORMS

Let $\mathcal{M}(S)$ be the set of signed measures on S . Then $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BL}}^*$ is defined by

$$\|\mu\|_{\text{BL}}^* := \max_{f \in B_{\text{BL}}^S} \langle \mu, f \rangle, \quad B_{\text{BL}}^S := \{f \in \text{BL}(S) : \|f\|_{\infty} + |f|_L \leq 1\}.$$

Let B_{BL}^S and B_{FM}^S be the sets of functions f such that $\|f\|_{\infty} + |f|_L \leq 1$ and $\|f\|_{\text{FM}} \leq 1$ respectively. Then $B_{\text{BL}}^S \subset B_{\text{FM}}^S$.

(37) Let $\mu \in \text{BL}(S)$. Then $\|\mu\|_{\text{BL}}^* = \max_{f \in B_{\text{BL}}^S} \langle \mu, f \rangle$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset S$, consisting of distinct points. Put $d_{ij} := d(x_i, x_j)$. Then*

$$\iota(B_{\text{BL}}^P) = \bigcap_{1 \leq i, j, k \leq n, k \neq i \neq j \neq k} \{f_k + (f_i - f_j)d_{ij}^{-1} \leq 1\} \cap \{-f_k - (f_i - f_j)d_{ij}^{-1} \leq 1\} \\ \cap \bigcap_{1 \leq i, k \leq n, i \neq k} \{f_k + (f_k - f_i)d_{ik}^{-1} \leq 1\} \cap \{-f_k - (f_k - f_i)d_{ik}^{-1} \leq 1\}.$$

FIG. 2. The unit ball B_{BL}^P for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BL}}$ on the space $\text{BL}(P, d)$, where $P = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $f \in \text{BL}(P, d)$ is represented by $(f_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $f_i := f(x_i)$. The defining conditions are given by those in Lemma 6.1, while the metric d is defined by $d_{ij} := d(x_i, x_j)$ with $d_{12} = 1, d_{13} = 2, d_{23} = 3$.

B_{BL}^P to P in \mathbb{C}^n
 B_{FM}^P in \mathbb{R}^n .




FIGURE 2. The unit ball B_{BL}^P for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BL}}$ on the space $\text{BL}(P, d)$, where $P = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ and $f \in \text{BL}(P, d)$ is represented by $(f_i) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ with $f_i := f(x_i)$. The defining conditions are given by those in Lemma 6.1, while the metric d is defined by $d_{ij} := d(x_i, x_j)$ with $d_{12} = 1, d_{13} = 2, d_{23} = 3$.

FIG. 2

P in \mathbb{C}^n

$\neq \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$(39) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i} \right\|_{\text{BL}}^* = \min_{f \in \iota(B_{\text{BL}}^P)} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i f_i = - \min_{f \in \iota(B_{\text{BL}}^P)} \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i f_i \right),$$

FIG. 2

6.1 in \mathbb{R}^n

Acknowledgement. We thank

for their comments on

Fig. 2.

APPENDIX A. MATLAB IMPLEMENTATIONS

A.1. FM-distance between a positive linear combination of Dirac measures and a positive measure.

```

% Computes  $\|\nu - \mu\|_{\text{FM}}$  for  $\nu$  in  $\text{Mol}^+(S)$ ,  $\mu$  in  $M^+(S)$ ,
%  $S=(S_{\min}, S_{\max}) \subset \mathbb{R}$  (possibly  $S_{\min}=-\text{Inf}$ ,  $S_{\max}=\text{Inf}$ )
%  $\mu = \sum \lambda_i \delta_{s_i}$ ,  $\nu = \sum a_i \delta_{s_i}$ 

Smin = 0;
Smax = Inf;
a = [1/2 2 1/5 1/3]; % a=[a_1,...,a_n]
n = length(a);
P = [0 1/3 1/2 3]; %supp(\nu)=[s_1,...,s_n]

h = @(s) exp(-s^2);
integrand = @(s,f)h(s)*max(-1,max(f-abs(P-s)));
psi = @(f) -dot(a,f)+integral(@(s) integrand(s,f),Smin,Smax,'ArrayValued',true);

A = [];
for i = 1:n
    for j = i+1:n
        B = zeros(1,n);
        B(i) = abs(P(i)-P(j))^-1;
        B(j) = -B(i);
        A = [A;B];
    end
end
end
A = [A;eye(n)];
A = [A;-A];

b = ones(n^2+n,1);
f0 = zeros(1,n);

[f,val] = fmincon(psi,f0,A,b);
f
norm = -val

```

A.2. FM-norm of a linear combination of Dirac measures.

```

function [norm,f] = FMdualnorm(a,dist)
%a=[a_1 a_2 ... a_n], mu=sum_{i=1}^n a_i delta_{s_i}, dist=[d_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n matrix
%norm =  $\|\mu\|_{\text{FM}}$ , f=ext pt for which  $\langle \mu, f \rangle = \text{norm}$ 
n=length(a);
A=[];
for i=1:n
    for j=i+1:n
        B=zeros(1,n);
        B(i)=dist(i,j)^-1;
    end
end

```

```

        B(j)=-B(i);
        A=[A;B];
    end
end
A=[A;eye(n)];
A=[A;-A];
b=ones(n^2+n,1); %m=#rows of A=2n+2(n choose 2)=2n+n(n-1)=n^2+n
minus_a=-a;
f=linprog(minus_a,A,b);
norm=a*f;

```

REFERENCES

- [1] Ackleh, A.S., D.F. Marshall, H.E. Heatherly and B.G. Fitzpatrick (1999). Survival of the fittest in a generalized logistic model, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **9**(9), pp. 1379–1391.
- [2] Ackleh, A.S., B.G. Fitzpatrick and H.R. Thieme (2005). Rate distributions and survival of the fittest: a formulation on the space of measures, *Discr. Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **5**(4), pp. 917–928.
- [3] Ackleh, A.S., N. Saintier and J. Skrzeczkowski (2019). Sensitivity equations for measure-valued solutions of transport equations, *Math. Biosci. Engineering* **17**(1), pp. 514–537.
- [4] Alkurdi, T., S.C. Hille and O. van Gaans (2013). Ergodicity and stability of a dynamical system perturbed by impulsive random interventions. *J. Math. An. Appl.* **63**, pp. 480–494.
- [5] Bačák, M. (2014). *Convex analysis and optimization in Hadamard spaces*, Vol. 22, De Gruyter.
- [6] Bertsekas, D.P. (2015). *Convex optimization algorithms*, Athena Scientific, Belmont.
- [7] Bertsimas, D. (1997). *Introduction to linear optimization*, Athena Scientific, Belmont.
- [8] Bogachev, V.I. (2007). *Measure Theory*, Volume II, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg.
- [9] Boyd, S. and L. Vandenberghe (2004). *Convex optimization*, Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Carillo, J.A., R.M. Colombo, P. Gwiazda and A. Ulikowska (2012). Structured populations, cell growth and balance laws, *J. Diff. Equ.* **252**, pp. 3245–3277.
- [11] Church, R.L., Z. Drezner and A. Tamir (2022). Extensions to the Weber problem, *Comput. Oper. Res.* **143**, p. 105786.
- [12] Cottet, G.H. and S. Mas-Gallic (1990). A particle method to solve the Navier-Stokes system, *Numer. Math.* **57**, pp. 805–827.
- [13] Czapla, D., S.C. Hille, K. Horbacz and H. Wodjewódka-Ściążko (2019). Continuous dependence of an invariant measure on the jump rate of a piecewise-deterministic Markov process, *Math. Biosci. Engineering* **17**(2), pp. 1059–1073.
- [14] Deutsch, F. (1980). Existence of best approximations, *J. Approx. Theory* **28**(2), pp. 132–154.
- [15] Dolbeault, J. and C. Schmeiser (2009). The two-dimensional Keller-Segel model after blow-up, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **25**(1), pp. 109–121.
- [16] Drezner, Z., K. Klamroth, A. Schöbel and G.O. Wesolowsky (2002). The Weber problem. In *Facility location*, Springer-Verlag, pp. 1–36.
- [17] Dudley, R. (1966). Convergence of Baire measures, *Studia Math.* **27**(3), pp. 251–268.
- [18] Evers, J.H.M. (2015). *Evolution equations for systems governed by social interactions*, PhD thesis, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.
- [19] Evers, J.H.M., S.C. Hille and A. Muntean (2016). Measure-valued mass evolution problems with flux boundary conditions and solution-dependent velocities, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **48**(3), pp. 1929–1953.
- [20] Gwiazda, P., S.C. Hille, K. Lyczek and A. Swierczewska-Gwiazda (2019). Differentiability in perturbation parameter of measure solutions to perturbed transport equation, *Kinetic and Related Models* **17**(2), pp. 1093–1108.
- [21] Herrero, A. and J.J.L. Velázquez (1997). A blow-up mechanism for a chemotaxis model, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **24**(4), pp. 633–683.
- [22] Hille, S.C., K. Horbacz and T. Szarek (2016). Existence of a unique invariant measure for a class of equicontinuous Markov operators with application to a stochastic model for an autoregulated gene, *Annales Mathématiques Blaise Pascal* **23**(2), pp. 171–217.

- [23] Hille, S.C. and D.T.H. Worm (2009). Embedding of semigroups of Lipschitz maps into positive linear semigroups on ordered Banach spaces generated by measures, *Integral Equ. Oper. Theory* **63**(3), pp. 351–371.
- [24] Jabłoński, J. and A. Marciniak-Czochra (2013), Efficient algorithms computing distances between Radon measures on \mathbb{R} , ArXiv preprint.
- [25] Kuhn, H.W. and R.E. Kuenne (1962). An efficient algorithm for the numerical solution of the generalized Weber problem in spatial economics, *J. Reg. Sci.* **4**(2), pp. 21–33.
- [26] Lasota, A. and J. Myjak (1999). Fractals, semifractals and Markov operators, *Int. J. Bif. Chaos* **9**(2), pp. 307–325.
- [27] Lasota, A., J. Myjak and T. Szarek (2002). Markov operators with a unique invariant measure, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **276**, pp. 343–356.
- [28] McShane, E.J. (1934). Extension of range of functions, *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.* **40**, pp. 837–842.
- [29] Pachl, J. (2013). *Uniform spaces and measures*, Fields Institute Monographs, Volume 30, The Fields Institute for Research in the Mathematical Sciences, Springer, New York.
- [30] Piccoli, B. and F. Rossi (2014). Generalized Wasserstein distance and its application to transport equations with source, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **211**, pp. 335–358.
- [31] Piccoli, B. F. Rossi and M. Tournus (2021). A Wasserstein norm for signed measures, with application to a non local transport equation with source term, *HAL preprint*. hal-01665244v5
- [32] Piccoli, B. and A. Tosin (2011). Time-evolving measures and macroscopic modeling of pedestrian flow, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **199**, pp. 707–738.
- [33] Rockafellar, R.T. (1972). *Convex analysis*, Princeton University Press.
- [34] Sriperumbudur, B.K., K. Fukumizu, A. Gretton, B. Schölkopf and G.R.G Lanckriet (2012). On the empirical estimation of integral probability metrics, *Electr. J. Stat.* **6**, pp. 1550–1599.
- [35] Villani, C. (2003). *Topics in Optimal Transportation*, American Mathematical Society, Providence.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, P.O. BOX 9512, 2300 RA LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS, (SH)

Email address: `shille@math.leidenuniv.nl` (corresponding author)

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, LEIDEN UNIVERSITY, P.O. BOX 9512, 2300 RA LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS, (ET)

Email address: `e.s.theewis@umail.leidenuniv.nl`