

On Carlier's inequality

Heinz H. Bauschke*, Shambhavi Singh[†] and Xianfu Wang[‡]

June 29, 2022

Abstract

The Fenchel-Young inequality is fundamental in Convex Analysis and Optimization. It states that the difference between certain function values of two vectors and their inner product is nonnegative. Recently, Carlier introduced a very nice sharpening of this inequality, providing a lower bound that depends on a positive parameter.

In this note, we expand on Carlier's inequality in three ways. First, a duality statement is provided. Secondly, we discuss asymptotic behaviour as the underlying parameter approaches zero or infinity. Thirdly, relying on cyclic monotonicity and associated Fitzpatrick functions, we present a lower bound that features an infinite series of squares of norms. Several examples illustrate our results.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 26B25, 47H05; Secondary 26D07, 90C25.

Keywords: Carlier's inequality, cyclic monotonicity, Fenchel conjugate, Fenchel-Young inequality, Fitzpatrick function, maximally monotone operator, proximal mapping, resolvent.

1 Introduction

Throughout the paper, we assume that

$$X \text{ is a real Hilbert space} \tag{1}$$

*Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Kelowna, B.C. V1V 1V7, Canada. E-mail: heinz.bauschke@ubc.ca.

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Kelowna, B.C. V1V 1V7, Canada. E-mail: sambha@student.ubc.ca.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Kelowna, B.C. V1V 1V7, Canada. E-mail: shawn.wang@ubc.ca.

with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and induced norm $\| \cdot \|$. We also assume throughout that

$$f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ is convex, lower semicontinuous, and proper,} \quad (2)$$

and that

$$A: X \rightrightarrows X \text{ is a maximally monotone operator on } X. \quad (3)$$

Recall that the *Fenchel conjugate* f^* of f is defined by $f^*(x^*) = \sup_{x \in X} (\langle x, x^* \rangle - f(x))$. The classical Fenchel-Young inequality states that for x and x^* in X , we have

$$G(x, x^*) := G_f(x, x^*) := f(x) + f^*(x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq 0, \quad (4)$$

and we have the well known equality characterization

$$G(x, x^*) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x^* \in \partial f(x). \quad (5)$$

(We assume the reader has some basic knowledge of convex analysis and monotone operator theory as can be found, e.g., in [3], [11], [12], and [13].) In [8], Carlier proved recently the following stunningly beautiful sharpening of (4):

$$f(x) + f^*(x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}, \quad (6)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ and $\text{Prox}_{\gamma f}$ is the proximal mapping of γf . He also discusses applications and connections to optimal transport, the Brøndsted–Rockafellar theorem, and tilted duality.

The aim of this paper is to expand on Carlier's work in three ways: (1) duality (see [Theorem 4.5](#)), (2) asymptotic behaviour (see [Theorem 5.1](#) and [Corollary 5.2](#)), and (3) cyclic monotonicity ([Corollary 7.4](#)).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), inequalities are provided based on the Fitzpatrick function. Useful identities involving the Minty parametrization are presented in [Section 3](#). Carlier's inequality and a new duality result are given in [Section 4](#). In [Section 5](#), we discuss the behaviour of the right side of (6) when $\gamma \rightarrow 0^+$ and $\gamma \rightarrow +\infty$. Various examples are presented in [Section 6](#) to illustrate our results. In [Section 7](#), we obtain sharpenings when the underlying operator A is cyclically monotone of an order bigger than 2.

The notation employed in this paper is fairly standard and follows largely [3].

2 The Fitzpatrick function

In this section, we start the approach to Carlier's result. Several of the proofs are implicit in Carlier's work; however, we include for completeness and the reader's convenience. Recall that the *Fitzpatrick function* for the operator A (see (3)) at $(x, x^*) \in X \times X$ is given by

$$F_A(x, x^*) := \langle x, x^* \rangle - \inf_{(a, a^*) \in \text{gra } A} \langle x - a, x^* - a^* \rangle \quad (7a)$$

$$= \sup_{(a,a^*) \in \text{gra } A} (\langle x, a^* \rangle + \langle a, x^* \rangle - \langle a, a^* \rangle); \quad (7b)$$

see [10] for the original paper and also [14] for various extensions, applications, and further references. It is known (see [10]) that

$$F_A(x, x^*) \geq \langle x, x^* \rangle, \quad \text{with equality if and only if } x^* \in Ax. \quad (8)$$

The next result will be useful later.

Proposition 2.1. Given x, y, x^*, y^* in X , we have

$$F_A(x, y^*) + F_A(y, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle - \langle y, y^* \rangle \geq \langle y - x, x^* - y^* \rangle, \quad (9)$$

and equality holds if and only if $y^* \in Ax$ and $x^* \in Ay$.

Proof. By (8), we have

$$F_A(x, y^*) \geq \langle x, y^* \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad F_A(y, x^*) \geq \langle y, x^* \rangle; \quad (10)$$

moreover, equality holds for both inequalities if and only if $y^* \in Ax$ and $x^* \in Ay$. Adding the two inequalities in (10), followed by subtracting $\langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle y, y^* \rangle$ from both sides, gives

$$F_A(x, y^*) + F_A(y, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle - \langle y, y^* \rangle \geq \langle x, y^* \rangle + \langle y, x^* \rangle - \langle x, x^* \rangle - \langle y, y^* \rangle \quad (11a)$$

$$= \langle y - x, x^* - y^* \rangle, \quad (11b)$$

as claimed. ■

Fact 2.2. (Fitzpatrick) We have $f \oplus f^* \geq F_{\partial f}$.

Proof. This is contained in [10]; see also the discussion in [4, Section 2]. For completeness, we include the short proof here. Let $(a, a^*) \in \text{gra } \partial f$. Then

$$\langle a, x^* \rangle + \langle x, a^* \rangle - \langle a, a^* \rangle = (\langle a, x^* \rangle - f(a)) + (\langle x, a^* \rangle - f^*(a^*)) \quad (12a)$$

$$\leq f^*(x^*) + f(x). \quad (12b)$$

The result follows by taking the supremum over $(a, a^*) \in \text{gra } \partial f$. ■

Corollary 2.3. (Carlier) Given x, y, x^*, y^* in X , we have

$$G_f(x, x^*) + G_f(y, y^*) \geq \langle y - x, x^* - y^* \rangle \quad (13)$$

and

$$G(x, x^*) + G(y, y^*) = \langle y - x, x^* - y^* \rangle \Leftrightarrow [y^* \in \partial f(x) \text{ and } x^* \in \partial f(y)]. \quad (14)$$

Proof. (See also [8, Section 1].) Using [Fact 2.2](#) and [Proposition 2.1](#), we always have

$$G(x, x^*) + G(y, y^*) = (f(x) + f^*(x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle) + (f(y) + f^*(y^*) - \langle y, y^* \rangle) \quad (15a)$$

$$= (f(x) + f^*(y^*)) + (f(y) + f^*(x^*)) - \langle x, x^* \rangle - \langle y, y^* \rangle \quad (15b)$$

$$\geq F_{\partial f}(x, y^*) + F_{\partial f}(y, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle - \langle y, y^* \rangle \quad (15c)$$

$$\geq \langle y - x, x^* - y^* \rangle, \quad (15d)$$

which is [\(13\)](#). We now turn to the proof of [\(14\)](#).

“ \Rightarrow ”: In this case, we have equality in [\(15d\)](#). In turn, the equality characterization in [Proposition 2.1](#) yields $y^* \in \partial f(x)$ and $x^* \in \partial f(y)$.

“ \Leftarrow ”: In this case, $f(x) + f^*(y^*) = \langle x, y^* \rangle$ and $f(y) + f^*(x^*) = \langle y, x^* \rangle$. It follows that

$$(f(x) + f^*(y^*)) + (f(y) + f^*(x^*)) - \langle x, x^* \rangle - \langle y, y^* \rangle = \langle x, y^* \rangle + \langle y, x^* \rangle - \langle x, x^* \rangle - \langle y, y^* \rangle \quad (16a)$$

$$= \langle y - x, x^* - y^* \rangle. \quad (16b)$$

Hence the chain of inequalities in [\(15\)](#) is actually a chain of equalities and we are done. \blacksquare

3 Minty parametrization

In this section, we employ the Minty parametrization and derive results that will be useful later. Recalling the standing assumption [\(3\)](#), and given points x, x^* in X and $\gamma > 0$, we have the well known equivalences (see, e.g., [\[3, Chapter 23\]](#)):

$$x^* \in Ax \Leftrightarrow x + \gamma x^* \in x + \gamma Ax \Leftrightarrow x = J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*), \quad (17)$$

where $J_{\gamma A} = (\text{Id} + \gamma A)^{-1}$ is the resolvent of γA .

Lemma 3.1. Let x, x^* be in X , and let $\gamma > 0$. Set

$$a := J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \quad \text{and} \quad a^* := \frac{x + \gamma x^* - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)}{\gamma}. \quad (18)$$

Then

$$x + \gamma x^* = a + \gamma a^*, \quad (19)$$

$$(a, a^*) \in \text{gra } A, \quad (20)$$

and

$$\langle a - x, x^* - a^* \rangle = \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}. \quad (21)$$

Moreover,

$$\|(x, x^*) - (a, a^*)\|^2 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2}\right) \|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2 \quad (22)$$

and

$$\|(x - a) - (x^* - a^*)\|^2 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)^2 \|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2. \quad (23)$$

Finally, we have the equivalences (which may or may not hold)

$$x^* \in Ax \Leftrightarrow a = x \Leftrightarrow a^* = x^* \Leftrightarrow \langle a - x, x^* - a^* \rangle = 0. \quad (24)$$

Proof. Clearly, (18) implies (19). By applying the classical Minty parametrization to γA , we have $(a, \gamma a^*) \in \text{gra}(\gamma A)$ and thus $(a, a^*) \in \text{gra} A$, i.e., (20) holds. Note that

$$x - a = x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \quad (25)$$

and

$$x^* - a^* = \frac{\gamma x^* - \gamma a^*}{\gamma} = \frac{\gamma x^* - (x + \gamma x^* - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*))}{\gamma} \quad (26a)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\gamma}(x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)). \quad (26b)$$

Combining (25) and (26), we deduce

$$-\langle x - a, x^* - a^* \rangle = \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}, \quad (27)$$

which is (21). Next, using (25) and (26) again, we obtain

$$\|(x, x^*) - (a, a^*)\|^2 = \|x - a\|^2 + \|x^* - a^*\|^2 \quad (28a)$$

$$= \|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2 + \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma^2}, \quad (28b)$$

which yields (22). Moreover, using (25), (26), and (27), we deduce that

$$\|(x - a) - (x^* - a^*)\|^2 = \|x - a\|^2 + \|x^* - a^*\|^2 - 2\langle x - a, x^* - a^* \rangle \quad (29a)$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} + \frac{2}{\gamma}\right) \|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2, \quad (29b)$$

which yields (23). We now turn to (24). We rewrite (28) as $\|x - a\|^2 + \|x^* - a^*\|^2 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2}\right) \|x - a\|^2$. Hence, invoking also (27), we obtain

$$\gamma \|x^* - a^*\|^2 = \frac{1}{\gamma} \|x - a\|^2 = -\langle x - a, x^* - a^* \rangle, \quad (30)$$

which yields the equivalences $x = a \Leftrightarrow x^* = a^* \Leftrightarrow \langle x - a, x^* - a^* \rangle = 0$. If $x = a$, then $(x, x^*) = (a, a^*) \in \text{gra} A$ by (20). And if $(x, x^*) \in \text{gra} A$, then (17) yields $x = a$. All this proves (24). ■

We now record a duality result.

Lemma 3.2. Let x, x^* be in X , and let $\gamma > 0$. Then

$$x^* - J_{\gamma^{-1}A^{-1}}(x^* + \gamma^{-1}x) = -\gamma^{-1}(x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)); \quad (31)$$

consequently,

$$\frac{\|x^* - J_{\gamma^{-1}A^{-1}}(x^* + \gamma^{-1}x)\|^2}{\gamma^{-1}} = \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}. \quad (32)$$

Proof. Using [3, Proposition 23.20], we have

$$x^* - J_{\gamma^{-1}A^{-1}}(x^* + \gamma^{-1}x) = x^* - (\text{Id} - \gamma^{-1}J_{\gamma A} \circ \gamma \text{Id})(x^* + \gamma^{-1}x) \quad (33a)$$

$$= x^* - (x^* + \gamma^{-1}x) + \gamma^{-1}J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \quad (33b)$$

$$= -\gamma^{-1}(x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)), \quad (33c)$$

which is (31) and from which (32) follows. ■

4 The Carlier bound and duality

This section contains a review of Carlier's inequality and a new duality result.

Definition 4.1. (Carlier bound) Recall (3), let x and x^* be in X , and let $\gamma > 0$. We define the associated *Carlier bound* by

$$C(x, x^*) := C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*) := \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}. \quad (34)$$

If $A = \partial f$, then

$$C(x, x^*) = C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, x^*) = \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}. \quad (35)$$

Theorem 4.2. (Carlier) Recall (3), and let x, x^* be in X . Then

$$(\forall \gamma > 0) \quad F_A(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*). \quad (36)$$

Proof. (See also [8, Section 2].) Let $\gamma > 0$ and set

$$a := J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \quad \text{and} \quad a^* := \frac{x + \gamma x^* - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)}{\gamma}. \quad (37)$$

By (7) and (21), we have

$$F_A(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle = - \inf_{(b, b^*) \in \text{gra } A} \langle x - b, x^* - b^* \rangle \quad (38a)$$

$$\geq \langle a - x, x^* - a^* \rangle \quad (38b)$$

$$= \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \quad (38c)$$

$$= C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*), \quad (38d)$$

as claimed. ■

Theorem 4.3. (Carlier) Let x and x^* be in X , and let $\gamma > 0$. Then

$$G_f(x, x^*) \geq F_{\partial f}(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, x^*). \quad (39)$$

Moreover, we have the characterization

$$G_f(x, x^*) = C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, x^*) \Leftrightarrow \quad (40a)$$

$$[\text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma x^*) \in \partial f^*(x^*) \quad \text{and} \quad x + \gamma x^* - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma x^*) \in \gamma \partial f(x)]. \quad (40b)$$

Proof. (See also [8, Section 1].) Write $A = \partial f$ so that $A^{-1} = \partial f^*$. Now set

$$a := J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \quad \text{and} \quad a^* := \frac{x + \gamma x^* - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)}{\gamma}. \quad (41)$$

Then (39) follows from Fact 2.2 and Theorem 4.2. We now derive this differently in order to characterize equality. By (20), we have $(a, a^*) \in \text{gra } A$. Hence, (5) yields

$$G_f(a, a^*) = 0. \quad (42)$$

Applying now (13) and (21) yields

$$G_f(x, x^*) = G_f(x, x^*) + G_f(a, a^*) \quad (43a)$$

$$\geq \langle a - x, x^* - a^* \rangle \quad (43b)$$

$$= \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}. \quad (43c)$$

Moreover, thanks to (14), we have equality characterization

$$G_f(x, x^*) = \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \Leftrightarrow [a^* \in Ax \text{ and } x^* \in Aa], \quad (44)$$

which is precisely (40). ■

Remark 4.4. In view of Theorem 4.2, the Carlier bound

$$C_{A,\gamma}(x, x^*) = \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \quad (45)$$

is always less sharp than the Fitzpatrick function bound

$$F_A(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle; \quad (46)$$

however, Carlier's lower bound is sharper than the trivial lower bound 0. Computing Fitzpatrick functions is not an easy task (see [4]) — there are many more examples of prox operators available (see [3] and [5]). See also [7] and [6] for recent work on Fitzpatrick functions and related objects.

Let us observe a new duality result, which links the Carlier bound of A to that of A^{-1} :

Theorem 4.5. (duality) Recall (3), let x, x^* be in X , and let $\gamma > 0$. Then

$$C_{A,\gamma}(x, x^*) = C_{A^{-1},\gamma^{-1}}(x^*, x). \quad (47)$$

Proof. Combine (34) with (32). ■

We conclude this section by outlining another possible area where Carlier's inequality may be useful – Bregman distances!

Remark 4.6. (Bregman distance) Recall (2) and that the Bregman distance between $x \in X$ and $y \in \text{int dom } f$ is defined by

$$D_f(x, y) = f(x) - f(y) - \langle x - y, \nabla f(y) \rangle. \quad (48)$$

Note that

$$D_f(x, y) = G_f(x, \nabla f(y)) \geq C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, \nabla f(y)) \quad (49)$$

by [Theorem 4.3](#). The Bregman distance plays a role, e.g., when analyzing the proximal gradient method (PGM). If $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence generated by the PGM and x is a solution, then $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D_f(x, y_n) < \infty$ (see, e.g., the proof of [\[5, Theorem 10.21\]](#)). It follows that $D_f(x, y_n) \rightarrow 0$ and also we learn from [\(49\)](#) that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, \nabla f(y_n)) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma \nabla f(y_n))\|^2}{\gamma} < +\infty. \quad (50)$$

This is a prototypical appearance of Carlier's inequality in the context of the analysis of algorithms.

5 Asymptotic behaviour

Let us now analyze the behaviour of Carlier's bound

$$C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*) = \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \quad (51)$$

when $\gamma \rightarrow 0^+$. Because of [Theorem 4.5](#), we also obtain information about the behaviour when $\gamma \rightarrow +\infty$.

Theorem 5.1. Recall [\(3\)](#), let x, x^* be in X , and let $\gamma > 0$. Then the following hold:

- (i) If $x \notin \overline{\text{dom } A}$, then $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*) = +\infty$.
- (ii) If $x \in \text{dom } A$, then $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*) = 0$.

Proof. (i): Suppose that $x \notin \overline{\text{dom } A}$. Set $\delta := d_{\overline{\text{dom } A}}(x) > 0$. Because $\text{ran } J_{\gamma A} = \text{dom}(\gamma A) = \text{dom } A$, we estimate

$$\frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \geq \frac{\delta^2}{\gamma}. \quad (52)$$

This yields the conclusion.

(ii): Suppose that $x \in \text{dom } A$. Recall that $\gamma Ax = (x - J_{\gamma A}x)/\gamma$ by definition of the Yosida approximation. Because resolvents are nonexpansive, we have

$$\|J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\| \leq \gamma \|x^*\|. \quad (53)$$

Clearly,

$$\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2 = \|x - J_{\gamma A}x\|^2 + \|J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2 \quad (54a)$$

$$+ 2 \langle x - J_{\gamma A}x, J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \rangle \quad (54b)$$

and this implies

$$\frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} = \gamma \|\gamma Ax\|^2 + \frac{\|J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \quad (55a)$$

$$+ 2 \langle \gamma Ax, J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \rangle. \quad (55b)$$

Because $x \in \text{dom } A$, we learn from [3, Corollary 23.46(i)] that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} \gamma Ax = {}^0Ax = P_{Ax}(0). \quad (56)$$

Consider the three summands on the right side of (55). It suffices to show that each one of them goes to 0 as $\gamma \rightarrow 0^+$. First, $\gamma Ax \rightarrow P_{Ax}(0)$ and thus $\gamma \|\gamma Ax\|^2 \rightarrow 0 \|P_{Ax}(0)\|^2 = 0$. Second, (53) yields $0 \leq (1/\gamma) \|J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2 \leq \gamma \|x^*\|^2 \rightarrow 0$ and therefore $(1/\gamma) \|J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2 \rightarrow 0$. Thirdly, (53) shows that $J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \rightarrow 0$. Combined with (56), we deduce that $2 \langle \gamma Ax, J_{\gamma A}x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*) \rangle \rightarrow 0$. ■

Corollary 5.2. Recall (3), let x, x^* be in X , and let $\gamma > 0$. Then the following hold:

- (i) If $x^* \notin \overline{\text{ran } A}$, then $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} C_{A,\gamma}(x, x^*) = +\infty$.
- (ii) If $x^* \in \text{ran } A$, then $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} C_{A,\gamma}(x, x^*) = 0$.

Proof. Theorem 4.5 yields

$$C_{A,\gamma}(x, x^*) = C_{A^{-1},\gamma^{-1}}(x^*, x). \quad (57)$$

The result is now clear from Theorem 5.1 (applied to A^{-1}) because $\text{ran } A = \text{dom } A^{-1}$. ■

Corollary 5.3. We have

$$\text{dom sup}_{\gamma > 0} C_{A,\gamma} \subseteq \overline{\text{dom } A} \times \overline{\text{ran } A}. \quad (58)$$

Proof. Combine Theorem 5.1 with Corollary 5.2. ■

6 Examples

In this section, we collect several examples to illustrate our results.

Example 6.1. (indicator of a subspace) Suppose that $A = N_U$, where U is a closed linear subspace of X . By [4, Example 3.1], the Fitzpatrick bound at $(x, x^*) \in X \times X$ is

$$F_{N_U}(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle = \iota_U(x) + \iota_{U^\perp}(x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle = (\iota_U \oplus \iota_{U^\perp})(x, x^*). \quad (59)$$

Let $\gamma > 0$. Because $J_{\gamma A} = P_U$ is linear, we compute Carlier's bound via

$$C_{N_U,\gamma}(x, x^*) = \frac{\|x - P_U(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} = \frac{\|P_{U^\perp}x\|^2 + \gamma^2 \|P_U x^*\|^2}{\gamma} \quad (60a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\gamma} \|P_{U^\perp} x\|^2 + \gamma \|P_U x^*\|^2. \quad (60b)$$

Note that $X \times X \times \mathbb{R}_{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: (x, x^*, \gamma) \mapsto C_{N_U, \gamma}(x, x^*)$ is *not* convex; however, $X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: (x, x^*) \mapsto C_{N_U, \gamma}(x, x^*)$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: \gamma \mapsto C_{N_U, \gamma}(x, x^*)$ are convex. Let us discuss further

$$\mathbb{R}_{++} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: \gamma \mapsto C_{N_U, \gamma}(x, x^*). \quad (61)$$

This function is (i) strictly increasing if $x \in U$ and $x^* \notin U^\perp$; (ii) strictly decreasing if $x \notin U$ and $x^* \in U^\perp$; (iii) first strictly decreasing then strictly increasing if $x \notin U$ and $x^* \notin U^\perp$; (iv) identically equal to 0 if $x \in U$ and $x^* \in U^\perp$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} C_{N_U, \gamma}(x, x^*) = \iota_U(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow +\infty} C_{N_U, \gamma}(x, x^*) = \iota_{U^\perp}(x^*). \quad (62)$$

It follows that

$$\sup_{\gamma > 0} C_{N_U, \gamma}(x, x^*) = \iota_U(x) + \iota_{U^\perp}(x^*) \quad (63)$$

coincides with the Fitzpatrick bound in this case.

Example 6.2. (energy) Suppose that $f = \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$ and hence $\nabla f = \text{Id}$. By [4, Example 3.10], the Fitzpatrick bound at $(x, x^*) \in X \times X$ is

$$F_{\text{Id}}(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \|x + x^*\|^2 - \langle x, x^* \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \|x - x^*\|^2. \quad (64)$$

Let $\gamma > 0$. Then $\text{Prox}_{\gamma f} = (\text{Id} + \gamma \text{Id})^{-1} = (1 + \gamma)^{-1} \text{Id}$ and hence Carlier's bound is

$$C_{\text{Id}, \gamma}(x, x^*) = \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} = \frac{\|x - (1 + \gamma)^{-1}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \quad (65a)$$

$$= \frac{\gamma}{(1 + \gamma)^2} \|x - x^*\|^2. \quad (65b)$$

If $x \neq x^*$, then $\gamma \mapsto C_{\text{Id}, \gamma}(x, x^*)$ is strictly concave on $]0, 2]$, strictly convex on $[2, +\infty[$, and its unique global maximizer is $\gamma = 1$ for which $C_{\text{Id}, 1}(x, x^*) = \frac{1}{4} \|x - x^*\|^2 = F_{\text{Id}}(x, x^*)$.

Example 6.3. (skew rotator) Suppose that $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ and that $A: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2: (x_1, x_2) \mapsto (-x_2, x_1)$, the counter-clockwise rotator by $\pi/2$, which is a skew isometry. By [2, Proposition 7.4],

$$F_A(x, x^*) = \iota_{\text{gra } A}(x, x^*) = F_A(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle. \quad (66)$$

Let $\gamma > 0$. Then $J_{\gamma A} = (1 + \gamma^2)^{-1}(\text{Id} - \gamma A): (x_1, x_2) \mapsto (1 + \gamma^2)^{-1}(x_1 + \gamma x_2, -\gamma x_1 + x_2)$. Thus, after some algebra, we find that Carlier's bound is

$$C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*) = \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma A}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} \quad (67)$$

$$= \frac{\gamma}{1 + \gamma^2} \|Ax - x^*\|^2. \quad (68)$$

Therefore, if $Ax \neq x^*$, then $\gamma \mapsto C_{A, \gamma}(x, x^*)$ is strictly concave on $]0, \sqrt{3}]$, strictly convex on $[\sqrt{3}, +\infty[$, and its unique global maximizer is $\gamma = 1$ for which $C_{A, 1}(x, x^*) = \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - x^*\|^2$.

We now focus on the case when $X = \mathbb{R}$ and thus $A = \partial f$. For ease of notation, we will use (x, y) instead of (x, x^*) as we do elsewhere.

Example 6.4. ((negative) Burg entropy) Suppose that $f(x) = -\ln(x)$ when $x > 0$, and $+\infty$ elsewhere, and let $\gamma > 0$. It is known (see, e.g., [5, Example 6.9] and [3, Example 24.40]) that for $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(z) = \frac{z + \sqrt{z^2 + 4\gamma}}{2}. \quad (69)$$

Hence, for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, y) = \frac{|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma y)|^2}{\gamma} \quad (70a)$$

$$= \frac{(x - \frac{1}{2}(x + \gamma y) - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(x + \gamma y)^2 + 4\gamma})^2}{\gamma} \quad (70b)$$

$$= \frac{((x - \gamma y) - \sqrt{(x + \gamma y)^2 + 4\gamma})^2}{4\gamma}; \quad (70c)$$

in particular,

$$C_{\partial f, \gamma}(0, y) = \frac{((0 - \gamma y) - \sqrt{(0 + \gamma y)^2 + 4\gamma})^2}{4\gamma} \quad (71a)$$

$$= \frac{(\gamma y + \sqrt{(\gamma y)^2 + 4\gamma})^2}{4\gamma} \quad (71b)$$

$$= \frac{(\sqrt{\gamma}\sqrt{\gamma y} + \sqrt{\gamma}\sqrt{\gamma y^2 + 4})^2}{(2\sqrt{\gamma})^2} \quad (71c)$$

$$= \left(\frac{\sqrt{\gamma y} + \sqrt{\gamma y^2 + 4}}{2} \right)^2 \quad (71d)$$

$$\rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } \gamma \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (71e)$$

Combining with [Theorem 5.1](#), we obtain

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, y) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } x < 0; \\ 1, & \text{if } x = 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } x > 0 \end{cases} \quad (72)$$

which is convex — but not lower semicontinuous — as a function of x .

Example 6.5. ((negative) Boltzmann-Shannon entropy) Suppose that f at $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } x < 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0; \\ x \ln(x) - x, & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases} \quad (73)$$

We start by showing that

$$\text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x) = \gamma W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp\left(\frac{x}{\gamma}\right)\right) \quad (74)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and where W is the *Lambert W-function* as defined in [9, Equation 1.5]. To see that, recall that (see, e.g., [3, Proposition 24.1]) the characterization of the proximal mapping

$$p = \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x) \Leftrightarrow \gamma \nabla f(p) + p = x \Leftrightarrow \gamma \ln(p) + p = x, \quad (75)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p > 0$. Hence

$$\frac{p}{\gamma} \exp\left(\frac{p}{\gamma}\right) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \exp\left(\frac{x}{\gamma}\right) \Leftrightarrow p = \gamma W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp\left(\frac{x}{\gamma}\right)\right) \quad (76)$$

by the very definition of the W function, and this verifies (74). Therefore

$$C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, y) = \frac{|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma y)|^2}{\gamma} \quad (77a)$$

$$= \frac{\left(x - \gamma W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp\left(\frac{x + \gamma y}{\gamma}\right)\right)\right)^2}{\gamma}. \quad (77b)$$

In particular,

$$C_{\partial f, \gamma}(0, y) = \gamma \left(W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp(y)\right)\right)^2 \quad (78a)$$

$$= \frac{\left(W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp(y)\right)\right)^2}{\frac{1}{\gamma}}. \quad (78b)$$

We wish to take now the limit as $\gamma \rightarrow 0^+$. As numerator and denominator tend to $+\infty$, we shall use L'Hospital's rule. Using the fact that

$$W'(z) = \frac{1}{(1 + W(z)) \exp(W(z))}, \quad (79)$$

we obtain

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} C_{\partial f, \gamma}(0, y) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{2W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp(y)\right) \exp(y)}{\exp\left(W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp(y)\right)\right) \left(1 + W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp(y)\right)\right)}. \quad (80)$$

Changing variables via $u = W\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \exp(y)\right)$, we finally obtain

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} C_{\partial f, \gamma}(0, y) = \lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{2u \exp(y)}{\exp(u)(1 + u)} = 0. \quad (81)$$

Combining this with [Theorem 5.1](#) gives us

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} C_{\partial f, \gamma}(x, y) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } x < 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } x \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (82)$$

Remark 6.6. The formulas (71) and (81) illustrate that the asymptotic behaviour at boundary points does not seem to follow a simple pattern and thus warrants further study.

7 Cyclic monotonicity

In this section, we extend the analysis to n -cyclically monotone operators. Recall that A is n -cyclically monotone, where $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, if

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (a_1, a_1^*) \in \text{gra } A \\ (a_2, a_2^*) \in \text{gra } A \\ \vdots \\ (a_n, a_n^*) \in \text{gra } A \\ a_{n+1} = a_1 \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^n \langle a_{k+1} - a_k, a_k^* \rangle \leq 0. \quad (83)$$

2-cyclic monotonicity is just regular monotonicity. The *Fitzpatrick function of order n* , $F_{A,n}$, evaluated at $(x, x^*) \in X \times X$, is the supremum over $(a_1, a_1^*), \dots, (a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^*)$ in $\text{gra } A$ of the expression

$$\langle x, x^* \rangle + \langle x - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle + \langle a_1 - x, x^* \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \langle a_{k+1} - a_k, a_k^* \rangle. \quad (84)$$

As a supremum of continuous affine functions, the function $F_{A,n}$ is convex and lower semicontinuous. We also set $F_{A,\infty} = \sup_{n \geq 2} F_{A,n}$.

Fact 7.1. (See [1, Corollary 2.8].) Suppose that A is maximally n -cyclically monotone. Then $F_{A,n} > \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ outside $\text{gra } A$, while $F_{A,n} = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\text{gra } A$.

We have (see [1, Remark 2.10]) the ordering

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \leq F_{A,2} \leq F_{A,3} \leq \dots \leq F_{A,n} \rightarrow F_{A,\infty}. \quad (85)$$

Moreover, if f is as in (2), then [1, Theorem 3.5] yields for every $(x, x^*) \in X \times X$

$$F_{\partial f, \infty}(x, x^*) = f(x) + f^*(x^*). \quad (86)$$

Computing $F_{A,n}$ is nontrivial; for some concrete examples, see [1, Section 4] and also [2].

We shall need the following identity.

Lemma 7.2. Let $(x, x^*) \in X$, and let $(a_1, a_1^*), \dots, (a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^*)$ be in $X \times X$. Then

$$\langle x - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle + \langle a_1 - x, x^* \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \langle a_{k+1} - a_k, a_k^* \rangle \quad (87a)$$

$$= \langle a_1 - x, x^* - a_1^* \rangle + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \langle a_k - x, a_{k-1}^* - a_k^* \rangle. \quad (87b)$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on $n \geq 2$. If $n = 2$, then the left side of (87) is

$$\langle x - a_1, a_1^* \rangle + \langle a_1 - x, x^* \rangle = \langle a_1 - x, x^* - a_1^* \rangle, \quad (88)$$

which is also equal to the right side of (87).

Now assume the result is true for some $n \geq 2$. We will show the result is also true for $n + 1$. Indeed, using the inductive hypothesis in (89d), we have

$$\langle x - a_n, a_n^* \rangle + \langle a_1 - x, x^* \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \langle a_{k+1} - a_k, a_k^* \rangle \quad (89a)$$

$$= \langle x - a_n, a_n^* \rangle - \langle x - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle + \langle a_n - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle \quad (89b)$$

$$+ \langle x - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle + \langle a_1 - x, x^* \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \langle a_{k+1} - a_k, a_k^* \rangle \quad (89c)$$

$$= \langle x - a_n, a_n^* \rangle - \langle x - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle + \langle a_n - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle \quad (89d)$$

$$+ \langle a_1 - x, x^* - a_1^* \rangle + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \langle a_k - x, a_{k-1}^* - a_k^* \rangle \quad (89e)$$

$$= \langle x - a_n, a_n^* \rangle - \langle x - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle + \langle a_n - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle - \langle a_n - x, a_{n-1}^* - a_n^* \rangle \quad (89f)$$

$$+ \langle a_1 - x, x^* - a_1^* \rangle + \sum_{k=2}^n \langle a_k - x, a_{k-1}^* - a_k^* \rangle \quad (89g)$$

$$= \langle a_1 - x, x^* - a_1^* \rangle + \sum_{k=2}^n \langle a_k - x, a_{k-1}^* - a_k^* \rangle \quad (89h)$$

and we are done. ■

Theorem 7.3. Let $(x, x^*) \in X \times X$. If $(a_1, a_1^*), \dots, (a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^*)$ belong to $\text{gra } A$, then

$$F_{A,n}(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq \langle a_1 - x, x^* - a_1^* \rangle + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \langle a_k - x, a_{k-1}^* - a_k^* \rangle. \quad (90)$$

Moreover, let $\gamma_1 > 0, \dots, \gamma_{n-1} > 0$ and set

$$a_1 := J_{\gamma_1 A}(x + \gamma_1 x^*), \quad a_1^* := \frac{x + \gamma_1 x^* - a_1}{\gamma_1} \quad (91a)$$

$$a_2 := J_{\gamma_2 A}(x + \gamma_2 a_1^*), \quad a_2^* := \frac{x + \gamma_2 a_1^* - a_2}{\gamma_2} \quad (91b)$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad (91c)$$

$$a_{n-1} := J_{\gamma_{n-1} A}(x + \gamma_{n-1} a_{n-2}^*), \quad a_{n-1}^* := \frac{x + \gamma_{n-1} a_{n-2}^* - a_{n-1}}{\gamma_{n-1}}. \quad (91d)$$

Then

$$F_{A,n}(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma_1 A}(x + \gamma_1 x^*)\|^2}{\gamma_1} + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \frac{\|x - J_{\gamma_k A}(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)\|^2}{\gamma_k}. \quad (92)$$

Proof. Indeed, using (84) and (87), we have

$$F_{A,n}(x, x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq \langle x - a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^* \rangle + \langle a_1 - x, x^* \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \langle a_{k+1} - a_k, a_k^* \rangle \quad (93a)$$

$$= \langle a_1 - x, x^* - a_1^* \rangle + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \langle a_k - x, a_{k-1}^* - a_k^* \rangle \quad (93b)$$

which is (90).

We now turn towards the ‘‘Moreover’’ part. By Lemma 3.1, the pairs $(a_1, a_1^*), \dots, (a_{n-1}, a_{n-1}^*)$ lie in gra A . The inequality (92) follows by combining (90) with (21). ■

Corollary 7.4. (a series lower bound) Recall that f satisfies (2), and let x, x^* be in X . Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{R}_{++} . Generate $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(a_n^*)_{n \geq 0}$ via

$$a_0^* := x^*, \quad (\forall n \geq 1) \quad a_n := \text{Prox}_{\gamma_n f}(x + \gamma_n a_{n-1}^*) \quad \text{and} \quad a_n^* := \frac{x + \gamma_n a_{n-1}^* - a_n}{\gamma_n}. \quad (94)$$

Then we obtain the lower bound

$$G_f(x, x^*) = f(x) + f^*(x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_k f}(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)\|^2}{\gamma_k}. \quad (95)$$

Proof. Because ∂f is maximally cyclically monotone, the result thus follows by combining (85), (86), and (92). ■

Remark 7.5. Consider Corollary 7.4 and its notation. Suppose that $(x, x^*) \in \text{dom } f \times \text{dom } f^*$. Then (95) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_k f}(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)\|^2}{\gamma_k} < +\infty; \quad \text{hence,} \quad \frac{x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_k f}(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)}{\sqrt{\gamma_k}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (96)$$

If we truncate the infinite series in (95) after the first term and set $\gamma = \gamma_1$, then we obtain Carlier’s bound (see Theorem 4.3)

$$f(x) + f^*(x^*) - \langle x, x^* \rangle \geq \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma f}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma}. \quad (97)$$

Example 7.6. Suppose that $f = \iota_U$, where U is a closed linear subspace of X . Then $\text{Prox}_{\gamma_n f} = P_U$ and for every $n \geq 1$, we have

$$a_n = P_U(x + \gamma_n a_{n-1}^*) = P_U x + \gamma_n P_U a_{n-1}^* \quad (98)$$

and

$$a_n^* = \frac{x + \gamma_n a_{n-1}^* - a_n}{\gamma_n} = \frac{x + \gamma_n a_{n-1}^* - P_U x - \gamma_n P_U a_{n-1}^*}{\gamma_n} \quad (99a)$$

$$= \frac{P_{U^\perp}x}{\gamma_n} + P_{U^\perp}a_{n-1}^* \in U^\perp \quad (99b)$$

$$\vdots \quad (99c)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{1}{\gamma_2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \right) P_{U^\perp}x + P_{U^\perp}x^* \in U^\perp; \quad (99d)$$

thus, $a_1 = P_Ux + \gamma_1 P_Ux^*$ and $a_2 = \cdots = a_n = P_Ux$. It follows that

$$\frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_1 f}(x + \gamma_1 a_0^*)\|^2}{\gamma_1} = \frac{\|x - P_U(x + \gamma_1 x^*)\|^2}{\gamma_1} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \|P_{U^\perp}x\|^2 + \gamma_1 \|P_Ux^*\|^2 \quad (100)$$

and that for every $k \geq 2$

$$\frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_k f}(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)\|^2}{\gamma_k} = \frac{\|x - P_U(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)\|^2}{\gamma_k} = \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \|P_{U^\perp}x\|^2 + \gamma_k \|P_U a_{k-1}^*\|^2 \quad (101a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \|P_{U^\perp}x\|^2. \quad (101b)$$

Therefore, the lower bound in (95) turns into

$$\gamma_1 \|P_Ux^*\|^2 + \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \right) \|P_{U^\perp}x\|^2 \quad (102)$$

which is strictly larger than Carlier's bound whenever $x \notin U$.

Example 7.7. Suppose that $f = \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 = f^*$, let $\gamma > 0$ and set $\gamma_n = \gamma$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then $\text{Prox}_{\gamma_k f} = (\text{Id} + \gamma_k \text{Id})^{-1} = (1 + \gamma)^{-1} \text{Id}$. Then for every $n \geq 1$, we have

$$a_n = \frac{x + \gamma a_{n-1}^*}{1 + \gamma} \quad (103)$$

and

$$a_n^* = \frac{x + \gamma a_{n-1}^* - a_n}{\gamma} = \frac{x + \gamma a_{n-1}^* - (1 + \gamma)^{-1}(x + \gamma a_{n-1}^*)}{\gamma} \quad (104a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 + \gamma} x + \frac{\gamma}{1 + \gamma} a_{n-1}^* \quad (104b)$$

$$\vdots \quad (104c)$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^n}{(1 + \gamma)^n} \right) x + \frac{\gamma^n}{(1 + \gamma)^n} x^*. \quad (104d)$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_1 f}(x + \gamma_1 a_0^*)\|^2}{\gamma_1} = \frac{\|x - (1 + \gamma)^{-1}(x + \gamma x^*)\|^2}{\gamma} = \frac{\gamma}{(1 + \gamma)^2} \|x - x^*\|^2 \quad (105)$$

and that for every $k \geq 2$

$$\frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_k f}(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)\|^2}{\gamma_k} = \frac{\gamma}{(1 + \gamma)^2} \|x - a_{k-1}^*\|^2 \quad (106a)$$

$$= \frac{\gamma}{(1 + \gamma)^2} \frac{\gamma^{2(k-1)}}{(1 + \gamma)^{2(k-1)}} \|x - x^*\|^2 \quad (106b)$$

$$= \frac{\gamma^{2k-1}}{(1 + \gamma)^{2k}} \|x - x^*\|^2. \quad (106c)$$

That is,

$$(\forall k \geq 1) \quad \frac{\|x - \text{Prox}_{\gamma_k f}(x + \gamma_k a_{k-1}^*)\|^2}{\gamma_k} = \frac{\gamma^{2k-1}}{(1 + \gamma)^{2k}} \|x - x^*\|^2. \quad (107)$$

Therefore, the lower bound in (95) turns into

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma^{2k-1}}{(1 + \gamma)^{2k}} \right) \|x - x^*\|^2 = \frac{\gamma}{1 + 2\gamma} \|x - x^*\|^2 \quad (108)$$

which is strictly greater than Carlier's bound $\gamma(1 + \gamma)^{-2} \|x - x^*\|^2$ whenever $x \neq x^*$.

Acknowledgments

We thank Guillaume Carlier for sending us his beautiful preprint [8]. HHB and XW were supported by NSERC Discovery Grants.

References

- [1] S. Bartz, H.H. Bauschke, J.M. Borwein, S. Reich, and X. Wang: Fitzpatrick functions, cyclic monotonicity and Rockafellar's antiderivative, *Nonlinear Analysis* 66, 1198–1223, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2006.01.013>
- [2] H.H. Bauschke, J.M. Borwein, and X. Wang: Fitzpatrick functions and continuous linear monotone operators, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 18(3), 789–809, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1137/060655468>
- [3] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes: *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, second edition, Springer, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48311-5>
- [4] H.H. Bauschke, D.A. McLaren, and H.S. Sendov: Fitzpatrick functions: inequalities, examples, and remarks on a problem by S. Fitzpatrick, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 13(3+4), 499–523, 2006. <https://www.heldermann.de/JCA/JCA13/JCA133/jca13043.htm>

- [5] A. Beck: *First-Order Methods in Optimization*, SIAM, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974997>
- [6] R.S. Burachik, M.N. Dao, and S.B. Lindstrom: Generalized Bregman envelopes and proximity operators, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 190(3), 744–778, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-021-01895-y>
- [7] R.S. Burachik, M.N. Dao, and S.B. Lindstrom: The generalized Bregman distance, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 31(1), 404–424, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1288140>
- [8] G. Carlier: Fenchel–Young inequality with a remainder and applications to convex duality and optimal transport, 2022. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03614052v2>
- [9] R.M. Corless, G.H. Gonnet, D.E. Hare, D.J. Jeffrey, and D.E. Knuth: On the Lambert W function, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 5(1), 329–359, 1996. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02124750>
- [10] S. Fitzpatrick: Representing monotone operators by convex functions, in *Workshop/Miniconference on Functional Analysis and Optimization (Canberra 1988)*, Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University vol. 20, Canberra, Australia, pp. 59–65, 1988.
- [11] B.S. Mordukhovich and N.M. Nam: *Convex Analysis and Beyond I: Basic Theory*, Springer, 2022.
- [12] R.T. Rockafellar: *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [13] R.T. Rockafellar and R.J-B Wets: *Variational Analysis*, Springer, 2004.
- [14] S. Simons: *From Hahn–Banach to Monotonicity*, Springer, 2008.