

CLOSED CONVEX SETS OF MOTZKIN AND GENERALIZED MINKOWSKI TYPES

JUAN ENRIQUE MARTÍNEZ LEGAZ[†]

Dept. of Economics and Economic History
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona,
and BGSMath
Spain

CORNEL PINTEA[‡]

Babeş-Bolyai University
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science
Cluj-Napoca
Romania

Dedicated to Francis Clarke on the occasion of his 75th birthday

Abstract

The aim of this paper is twofold. On one hand the generalized Minkowski sets are defined and characterized. On the other hand, the Motzkin decomposable sets, along with their epigraphic versions are considered and characterized in new ways. Among them, the closed convex sets with one single minimal face, i.e. translated closed convex cones, along with their epigraphic counterparts are particularly studied.

Keywords: Closed convex sets, minimal and lowest dimensional faces, epigraphs.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 52A20;26B25

1 Introduction

Every compact convex subset of the Euclidean space is, according to the Minkowski theorem [6], the convex hull of the set of its extreme points (see also [1, p.52]

*Corresponding author

[†]This author was supported by the Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades [PGC2018-097960-B-C21] and the Severo Ochoa Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D [SEV-2015-0563]. He is affiliated with MOVE (Markets, Organizations and Votes in Economics).

[‡]This author was supported by Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades [PGC2018-097960-B-C21] and by AGC31333/23.03.2022 and AGC31334/23.03.2022.

and [2, Theorem 2.7.2]). However, the class of all closed convex subsets that are representable as their own sets of extreme points is significantly much larger and we called them *Minkowski sets*. Indeed, there are many unbounded Minkowski sets and we characterized them in [4]. For such subsets the extreme points are obviously minimal and lowest dimensional faces as well. In this paper we first prove that a face of a closed convex subset of the Euclidean space is minimal if and only if it is lowest dimensional. Such faces are also shown to be lineality invariant, and several other properties of them are proved. We next enlarge the class of Minkowski sets to the one of *generalized Minkowski sets*, which are intensively studied here. This latter class consists of all closed convex subsets of the Euclidean space that are representable as the convex hull of the union of its minimal (lowest dimensional) faces.

The paper is organized as follows: In the second section we prove several characterizations of the lowest dimensional faces of a closed convex subset of the Euclidean space. This is done by proving several helpful statements before. The equivalence between the minimality of a face of a closed convex set and its quality to be lowest dimensional appears as a corollary afterwards. The third section is devoted to new characterizations of Motzkin decomposable sets and their epigraphic versions. Note that several characterizations of Motzkin decomposable sets were done before by Goberna, Martinez-Legaz and Todorov [3]. The particular case of translated closed convex cones is also studied by highlighting their property to have one single minimal face. Actually, this property characterizes closed convex cones. Finally, in the last section an important class of generalized Minkowski sets is highlighted, namely that consisting of those closed convex sets whose Pareto like sets cover their relative boundaries.

2 Definitions and preliminary results

We consider the closed convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^n that can be represented as the convex hull of their lowest dimensional faces. The Minkowski sets (see [4]) are obviously particular examples of such closed convex sets. On the other hand, every Minkowski set C can produce extra sets with the above property simply by considering $C + U$, where U is a suitable subspace. We will prove that, in fact, every set with the above property is the sum of a Minkowski set with a subspace.

Throughout the whole paper, $0^+C := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : y + C \subseteq C\}$ stands for the *recession cone* of a closed convex set C . Recall that 0^+C is a convex cone [8, Theorem 18.1] and $\text{lin } C := 0^+C \cap (-0^+C)$ is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n called the *lineality* of C .

Recall that the *polar cone* of a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$S^0 := \{x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^*, x \rangle \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in S\},$$

and the *barrier cone* $\text{barr}(C)$ of C consists of those vectors $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for which there exists $\alpha_{x^*} \in \mathbb{R}$ with the property $\langle c, x^* \rangle \leq \alpha_{x^*}$, for every $c \in C$. In other

words,

$$\text{barr}(C) := \left\{ x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sup_{c \in C} \langle c, x^* \rangle < \infty \right\}.$$

It is well known that $\text{barr}(C)$ is a convex cone and $[\text{barr}(C)]^\circ = 0^+C$.

Definition 2.1. A vector x^* is said to be *normal* to a convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ at a point $x \in C$ if $\langle c - x, x^* \rangle \leq 0$, for all $c \in C$. The set of vectors normal to C at x is a closed convex cone denoted by $N_C(x)$ and is called the *normal cone* to C at x .

Note that the normal cone to C at every interior point of C reduces to $\{0\}$. We extend the, possibly multivalued, mapping $N_C : C \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ to the whole space \mathbb{R}^n by setting $N_C(x) := \emptyset$ whenever $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus C$. Denote by $N_C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the range of N_C , i.e. the union of the normal cones to C at all points of C , and call it the *total normal cone* of C . Note that the total normal cone need not be convex.

For a lower semicontinuous proper convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, one has $\partial f^* = (\partial f)^{-1}$, i.e.

$$x^* \in \partial f(x) \Leftrightarrow x \in \partial f^*(x^*), \quad (1)$$

where f^* stands for the conjugate function of f and $\partial f(x)$ for the subdifferential of f at x . Recall that f^* and ∂f are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} f^*(x^*) &:= \sup_x \{ \langle x, x^* \rangle - f(x) \}, \\ \partial f(x) &:= \{ x^* \mid f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle x^*, y - x \rangle, \forall y \}. \end{aligned}$$

For example, the support function σ_C of C is the conjugate δ_C^* of the indicator function δ_C of C . Recall that these two functions are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_C : \mathbb{R}^n &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \sigma_C(x^*) := \sup_{c \in C} \langle c, x^* \rangle, \\ \delta_C(c) &:= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c \in C \\ +\infty & \text{if } c \notin C. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We also observe that

$$\text{dom}(\sigma_C) := \{ x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sigma_C(x^*) < +\infty \} = \text{barr}(C).$$

and

$$\text{dom}(\partial \sigma_C) := \{ x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \partial \sigma_C \neq \emptyset \} = N_C(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

as

$$\partial \delta_C = N_C;$$

moreover, as a consequence of (1), if C is convex and closed, then

$$x^* \in N_C(x) \Leftrightarrow x \in \partial \sigma_C(x^*).$$

Theorem 1. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$ (i.e., a linear subspace such that $U \oplus \text{lin } C = \mathbb{R}^n$), and F be a nonempty face of C . The following statements are equivalent:

1. F is lowest dimensional.
2. F is an affine variety.
3. $F = x + \text{lin } C$ for some $x \in C$.
4. $F \cap U$ is a singleton.
5. $F \cap U$ is the singleton of an extreme point of $C \cap U$.
6. $F = x + \text{lin } C$ for some $x \in \text{ext}(C \cap U)$.

Remark 2.1. In fact, 6 implies that F is a face of C . To see this, we consider two points $p, q \in C$ such that $(1-t)p + tq \in x + \text{lin } C$ for some $t \in (0,1)$ and the decomposition $p = p_U + p_l$ and $q = q_U + q_l$, where $p_U, q_U \in U$ and $p_l, q_l \in \text{lin } C$, due to the direct sum decomposition $U \oplus \text{lin } C = \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that $p_U = p - p_l$, $q_U = q - q_l \in C + \text{lin } C = C$, namely $p_U, q_U \in C \cap U$, and therefore

$$(1-t)p_U + tq_U = (1-t)p + tq - ((1-t)p_l + tq_l) \in x + \text{lin } C - \text{lin } C = x + \text{lin } C.$$

Consequently,

$$(1-t)p_U + tq_U \in C \cap U \cap (x + \text{lin } C) \subseteq U \cap (x + \text{lin } C) = \{x\}$$

(the latter equality following from the fact that $x \in U$), which shows that $p_U, q_U = x$, as x is an extreme point of $C \cap U$. Thus

$$p = x + p_l, q = x + q_l \in x + \text{lin } C,$$

which completes the proof that F is a face of C .

Corollary 2. A face F of the closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is lowest dimensional if and only if F is minimal.

Proof. If F is lowest dimensional, then F is obviously minimal, as a proper face of F would have dimension strictly smaller than $\dim F$. Conversely, assume that F is minimal and not lowest dimensional, i.e. F is not an affine variety, according to Theorem 1. Since F is minimal, it is not a closed half of any affine variety either, as every halfflat has a proper face. According to [10, Theorem 2.6.12], $F = \text{conv rbd } F$ and the inequality $\dim F_a < \dim F$ holds for every $a \in \text{rbd } F$, where F_a is the smallest face of F containing a , i.e. the intersection of all faces of F that contain a (see [10, Corollary 2.6.11]). This shows that F is not minimal, as it has a proper face F_a . We have thus obtained a contradiction. \square

We will denote by $MF(C)$ the union of the minimal (equivalently, lowest dimensional) faces of a closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

Corollary 3. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$. Then*

$$MF(C) = \text{ext}(C \cap U) + \text{lin } C.$$

In particular,

$$MF(C) = \text{ext}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C.$$

In order to prove Theorem 1, we need some preliminary results.

Proposition 4. *If F is a nonempty face of a closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, then*

$$\text{lin } F = \text{lin } C.$$

Proof. The inclusion \subseteq is obvious, as one has $0^+(F) \subseteq 0^+(C)$ (see [8, Theorem 8.3, p. 63]). To prove the opposite inclusion, let $d \in \text{lin } C$ and take $x \in F$. Since $x = \frac{1}{2}(x+d) + \frac{1}{2}(x-d)$ and $x+d, x-d \in C$, we have $x+d, x-d \in F$, which shows that both d and $-d$ belong to $0^+(F)$, that is, $d \in \text{lin } F$, and the equality $\text{lin } F = \text{lin } C$ is completely proved. \square

Corollary 5. *If F is a nonempty face of a closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, then F contains l_C -dimensional affine varieties, where $l_C = \dim(\text{lin } C)$. In particular $\dim F \geq \dim(\text{lin } C)$.*

Lemma 6. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$. A nonempty face F of C is lowest dimensional if and only if it is an l_C -dimensional affine variety of \mathbb{R}^n parallel with $\text{lin } C$. In such a case the intersection $F \cap U$ is a singleton, say $\{x_F\}$, with x_F being an extreme point of $C \cap U$, and $F = x_F + \text{lin } C$.*

Proof. Assume that F is a lowest dimensional face of the closed convex set C . Then F has no proper faces and empty relative boundary therefore. In other words the boundary of F in $\text{aff}(F)$ is empty, which shows, due to the connectedness of $\text{aff}(F)$, that $F = \text{aff}(F)$ (see e.g [9, p. 86]). Thus $F = x + V$ for some $x \in F$ and some subspace V of \mathbb{R}^n . Since

$$F + V = x + V + V = x + V = F,$$

we have $V \subseteq 0^+C$ as well as $V = -V \subseteq -0^+C$, namely

$$V \subseteq 0^+C \cap (-0^+C) = \text{lin } C.$$

To prove the converse inclusion, let $d \in \text{lin } C$. Then we have $x+d, x-d \in C$; hence, since $\frac{1}{2}(x+d) + \frac{1}{2}(x-d) \in F$ and F is a face, we have $x+d \in F = x+V$, that is, $d \in V$. This shows that $V = \text{lin } C$.

Conversely, if the face F of C is an l_C -dimensional affine variety of \mathbb{R}^n parallel with $\text{lin } C$, then it is obviously lowest dimensional due to Corollary 5.

The intersection $F \cap U$ is obviously a singleton, say $\{x_F\}$, and one has $F = x_F + \text{lin } C$. In order to justify the extreme property of x_F , assume that

$x_F = (1-t)p + tq$ for some $p, q \in C \cap U$ and some $t \in]0, 1[$. Since $x_F \in F$ and F is a face of C , it follows that $p, q \in F = x_F + \text{lin } C$. Thus $p = x_F + p_l$ and $q = x_F + q_l$ for some $p_l, q_l \in \text{lin } C$. On the other hand,

$$p_l = p - x_F, \quad q_l = q - x_F \in U.$$

as $p, q, x_F \in U$. Thus $p_l, q_l \in U \cap \text{lin } C \cap U$, which shows that $p_l = q_l = 0$ and therefore $p = x_F = q$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. The equivalence $[1 \Leftrightarrow 3]$ and the implication $[1 \Rightarrow 5]$ follow from Lemma 6.

$[2 \Rightarrow 3]$. Assume that $F = x + V$ for some $x \in F$ and a subspace V of \mathbb{R}^n . Since $V = \text{lin } F$, equality 3 follows via Proposition 4.

The implications $[3 \Rightarrow 2]$, $[5 \Rightarrow 4]$ and $[6 \Rightarrow 3]$ are obvious.

The implication $[4 \Rightarrow 6]$ follows from the equality $F = F \cap U + \text{lin } F$. \square

3 Closed convex sets with a single minimal face and Motzkin decomposable sets

In this section we first characterize the closed convex translated cones along with their epigraphic counterparts in terms of their minimal faces. The Motzkin decomposable sets along with the Motzkin decomposable functions are characterized afterwards.

Remark 3.1. A closed convex cone K has one single minimal face. Its single minimal face is $\text{lin } K$. Indeed we first observe that 0 is the only extreme point of $K \cap (\text{lin } K)^\perp$. Therefore $\text{lin } K = 0 + \text{lin } K$ is the only minimal face of K , due to Theorem 1(6). Note that a translated closed convex cone has the same property.

Proposition 7. *If a closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ has one single minimal face F , then this face is contained in any face of C . In other words, F is the intersection of all faces of C .*

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of the fact that every face of C contains a minimal face. \square

Proposition 8. *A nonempty closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ has one single minimal face if and only if it is a closed convex cone or a translated closed convex cone.*

Proof. The obvious implication is Remark 3.1. We now assume that the closed convex set C has one single minimal face. We assume that the origin of \mathbb{R}^n belongs to the minimal face F of C , as otherwise we translate the set with the opposite of a vector in F . We will prove that, under this assumption, C is actually a cone. In what follows we will use an inductive argument on the dimension of C to show that the positive multiples of the vectors in C remain

in C . Indeed, if C is 0-dimensional, i.e. $C = \{0\}$, then it is obviously a cone. We now assume that $\dim C \geq 1$ and the proper faces of C , which have a strictly smaller dimension, are cones. If $x \in C$ would be a point such that $tx \notin C$ for some $t > 0$, then $sx \in \text{rbd } C$, where $s = \sup\{\lambda > 0 \mid \lambda x \in C\} \geq 1$, i.e. sx belongs to a proper face of C , which is, by the inductive hypothesis, a cone. In particular, $tx = ts^{-1}(sx)$ belongs to that proper face and therefore to C , which is absurd. \square

Remark 3.2. The epigraph of a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a nonempty closed convex cone if and only if f is in the orbit of a lower semicontinuous (l.s.c., in brief) proper sublinear function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ with respect to the action

$$(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^n}, ((u, v), \phi) \mapsto (u, v) \oplus \phi,$$

where $((u, v) \oplus \phi)(x) := \phi(x + u) - v$. Note that

$$\text{epi}((u, v) \oplus \phi) = \text{epi } \phi - (u, v),$$

for all $((u, v), \phi) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^n}$.

From Remark 3.2 and Proposition 8, one obtains the following result.

Corollary 9. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a l.s.c. proper convex function. Then there exist $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\cdot + u) - v$ is sublinear if and only if $\text{epi } f$ has one single minimal face.*

The last result in this section is a counterpart to Corollary 12 for functions.

Proposition 10. *For a l.s.c. proper convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and a point $u \in \text{dom } f$ such that $\text{dom } f - u$ is a cone, there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\cdot + u) - v$ is sublinear if and only if $\partial f(\mathbb{R}^n) = \partial f(u)$.*

Proof. Let $g := f(\cdot + u) - v$. Since $\text{dom } g = \text{dom } f - u$ and $\partial g(x) = \partial f(x + u)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we assume, without loss of generality, that $u = 0$ and $v = 0$, so that $\text{dom } f$ is a cone and $f(0) = 0$. If f is sublinear, from the well known (and easy to prove) equality

$$\partial f(x) = \partial f(0) \cap \{x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^*, x \rangle = f(x)\}, \quad (2)$$

which holds for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it immediately follows that $\partial f(\mathbb{R}^n) = \partial f(0)$. Conversely, assume that the latter equality holds and define $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by $h(x) := \sup_{x^* \in \partial f(0)} \langle x^*, x \rangle$. Clearly, h is sublinear and, since $f(0) = 0$, it is a minorant of f . We will actually prove that $h = f$. To this aim, let $x' \in \text{dom } \partial f$ and take $x_0^* \in \partial f(x')$. Then, by (2), we have $f(x') = \langle x_0^*, x' \rangle$. Hence, by the lower semicontinuity of f and the fact that $\text{dom } \partial f$ is dense in $\text{dom } f$ (by Brøndsted–Rockafellar theorem), for every $x \in \text{dom } f$ we get $f(x) \leq \langle x_0^*, x \rangle \leq \sup_{x^* \in \partial f(0)} \langle x^*, x \rangle = h(x)$, the latter inequality following from the relations $x_0^* \in \partial f(x) \subseteq \partial f(\mathbb{R}^n) = \partial f(0)$. We have thus proved that $f = h$ on $\text{dom } f$. Since $\text{dom } f$ is a convex cone, this shows that f is sublinear. \square

We say that a nonempty closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is Motzkin decomposable (M -decomposable in short) if there exist a decomposition $C = C_0 + K$, with the set $C_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ being convex and compact and K being a closed convex cone. Then we say that C_0 and K are the compact and conic components, respectively, of that decomposition. The conic component is uniquely determined, namely, one has $K = 0^+(C)$. The original Motzkin Theorem [7] asserts that every polyhedral convex set is the sum of a polytope and a polyhedral convex cone, namely it is M -decomposable. From the following characterization of Motzkin decomposable sets, we will obtain a new characterization of closed convex cones.

Proposition 11. *For a nonempty closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a compact convex set $C_0 \subseteq C$, the following statements are equivalent:*

1. C is Motzkin decomposable and C_0 is a compact component of C .
2. $N_C(\mathbb{R}^n) = N_C(C_0)$.

Proof. [1 \implies 2] It is enough to observe that, for $c \in C_0$ and $d \in 0^+(C)$, one has $N_C(c+d) \subseteq N_C(c)$.

[2 \implies 1] From the well known equality

$$C = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^*, x \rangle \leq \delta_C^*(x^*) \quad \forall x^* \in N_C(\mathbb{R}^n)\},$$

using that $\delta_C^*(x^*) = \delta_{C_0}^*(x^*)$ for every $x^* \in N_C(C_0)$, by 2 we obtain

$$C = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^*, x \rangle \leq \delta_{C_0}^*(x^*) \quad \forall x^* \in N_C(C_0)\}. \quad (3)$$

Since $\delta_{C_0}^*$ is continuous, we can replace $N_C(C_0)$ with its closure in (3); therefore, by $cl N_C(C_0) = cl N_C(\mathbb{R}^n) = cl \text{barr } C = (\text{barr } C)^{00} = (0^+(C))^0$, we obtain

$$C = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^*, x \rangle \leq \delta_{C_0}^*(x^*) \quad \forall x^* \in (0^+(C))^0\right\}.$$

Observe that this equality can be equivalently written

$$C = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^*, x \rangle \leq \delta_{C_0}^*(x^*) + \delta_{(0^+(C))^0}(x^*) \quad \forall x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n\right\}. \quad (4)$$

Hence, since $\delta_{(0^+(C))^0} = \delta_{0^+(C)}^*$ and $\delta_{C_0}^* + \delta_{0^+(C)}^* = \delta_{C_0+0^+(C)}^*$, equality (4) yields

$$C = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x^*, x \rangle \leq \delta_{C_0+0^+(C)}^*(x^*) \quad \forall x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n\right\} = C_0 + 0^+(C),$$

which proves 1. □

Corollary 12. *A closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a cone with vertex $x_0 \in C$ (that is, $C - x_0$ is a cone) if and only if $N_C(\mathbb{R}^n) = N_C(x_0)$.*

Proof. Apply Proposition 11 with $C_0 := \{x_0\}$. □

Another characterization of Motzkin decomposable sets in terms of the range of its associated normal cone mapping is provided next.

Proposition 13. *A nonempty closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is Motzkin decomposable if and only if*

$$N_C(\mathbb{R}^n) = (0^+(C))^0. \quad (5)$$

Proof. We first observe that the inclusion \subseteq in (5) holds for every closed convex set C . Assume now that C is Motzkin decomposable and C_0 is a compact component of C , and let $x^* \in 0^+(C)$. Since C_0 is compact, we have $x^* \in N_{C_0}(x)$ for some $x \in C_0$. Then, for every $c \in C_0$ and $d \in 0^+(C)$, we have

$$\langle x^*, c + d \rangle = \langle x^*, c \rangle + \langle x^*, d \rangle \leq \langle x^*, x \rangle,$$

which shows that $x^* \in N_C(x) \subseteq N_C(\mathbb{R}^n)$, thus completing the proof of (5).

Conversely, assume that (5) holds and define

$$C_0 := N_C^{-1} \left(S^{n-1} \cap (0^+(C))^0 \right).$$

The mapping N_C^{-1} is upper semicontinuous, since $N_C^{-1} = (\partial\delta_C)^{-1} = \partial\delta_C^*$; therefore, as $S^{n-1} \cap (0^+(C))^0$ is compact, C_0 is compact, too. We will now prove the equality

$$C = C_0 + 0^+(C). \quad (6)$$

The inclusion \subseteq is immediate, since $C_0 \subseteq C$. To prove the opposite inequality, let $x \in C$ and \bar{x} denote the projection of x onto $C_0 + 0^+(C)$. Then, using (5), we obtain $x - \bar{x} \in N_{C_0 + 0^+(C)}(\bar{x}) \subseteq (0^+(C))^0 = N_C(\mathbb{R}^n)$, so that

$$x - \bar{x} \in N_C(\hat{x}) \text{ for some } \hat{x} \in C. \quad (7)$$

Since $\bar{x} \in C$, by (7) we have

$$\langle x - \bar{x}, \bar{x} - \hat{x} \rangle \leq 0. \quad (8)$$

We claim that $x = \bar{x}$. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that $x \neq \bar{x}$. Then

$$\frac{x - \bar{x}}{\|x - \bar{x}\|} \in S^{n-1} \cap (0^+(C))^0,$$

which implies that $\hat{x} \in C_0$. Therefore, $\langle x - \bar{x}, \hat{x} - \bar{x} \rangle \leq 0$, which, together with (8), yields $\langle x - \bar{x}, \bar{x} \rangle = \langle x - \bar{x}, \hat{x} \rangle$. We thus have

$$\|x - \bar{x}\|^2 = \langle x - \bar{x}, x - \bar{x} \rangle = \langle x - \bar{x}, x - \hat{x} \rangle \leq 0,$$

the latter inequality following from (7). So, we conclude that

$$x = \bar{x} \in C_0 + 0^+(C),$$

which completes the proof of (6). Taking convex hulls in both sides of (6), we obtain $C = \text{conv}(C_0 + 0^+(C)) = \text{conv}(C_0) + 0^+(C)$. Since $\text{conv}(C_0)$ is a compact convex set, this shows that C is Motzkin decomposable. \square

Recall that the recession function $f0^+ : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ of a l.s.c. proper convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is the l.s.c. proper sublinear function defined by $\text{epi } f0^+ = 0^+(\text{epi } f)$. We omit the easy proof of the following Proposition.

Proposition 14. *If $s : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a l.s.c. proper sublinear function, then*

$$(\text{epi } s)^0 = \left((\text{dom } s)^0 \times \{0\} \right) \cup \mathbb{R}_+ (\partial s(0) \times \{-1\}).$$

Applying Proposition 13 to the epigraph of a l.s.c. proper convex function yields the following corollary.

Corollary 15. *A l.s.c. proper convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is Motzkin decomposable if and only if $(\text{dom } f0^+)^0 = N_{\text{dom } f}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\partial f0^+(0) = \partial f(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. According to [5, Lemma 27], we have

$$N_{\text{epi } f}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}) = (N_{\text{dom } f}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \{0\}) \cup \mathbb{R}_+ (\partial f(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \{-1\}).$$

Hence, the equivalence easily follows from combining Proposition 13, applied to $C := \text{epi } f$, with Proposition 14, applied to $s := f0^+$. \square

Corollary 16. *A globally Lipschitzian convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Motzkin decomposable if and only if $\partial f0^+(0) = \partial f(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. By [8, Theorem 10.5], the recession function $f0^+$ is finite everywhere; hence, $(\text{dom } f0^+)^0 = (\mathbb{R}^n)^0 = \{0\}$. On the other hand, since f is finite everywhere too, we have $N_{\text{dom } f}(\mathbb{R}^n) = N_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{0\}$. Therefore, the equivalence is an immediate consequence of Corollary 15. \square

4 Generalized Minkowski sets

In this section we introduce the notions of generalized Minkowski set and generalized Minkowski function and provide several characterizations of such new notions. In this respect, several auxiliary results are also proved.

Definition 4.1. A nonempty closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ which is the convex hull of its minimal faces is called a *generalized Minkowski set*, that is, if

$$C = \text{conv } MF(C). \tag{9}$$

Theorem 17. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$. Then, C is a generalized Minkowski set if and only if $C \cap U$ is a Minkowski set.*

In particular, C is a generalized Minkowski set if and only if the orthogonal slice $C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$ is a Minkowski set.

Proof. Assume that $C \cap U$ is a Minkowski set. This quality of $C \cap U$ combined with [8, p. 65] and the additivity of the conv operator and Corollary 3 leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} C = C \cap U + \text{lin } C &= \text{conv ext}(C \cap U) + \text{lin } C \\ &= \text{conv ext}(C \cap U) + \text{conv lin } C \\ &= \text{conv}(\text{ext}(C \cap U) + \text{lin } C) \\ &= \text{conv } MF(C). \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, assume that $C = \text{conv } MF(C)$ and let $x \in C \cap U$. Since $x \in C$, it follows that $x = \lambda_1 x_1 + \dots + \lambda_m x_m$ for some $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in [0, 1]$ such that $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_m = 1$ and some $x_1 \in F_1, \dots, x_m \in F_m$, where

$$F_1 = x_{F_1} + \text{lin } C, \dots, F_m = x_{F_m} + \text{lin } C$$

are lowest dimensional faces of C and $x_{F_1}, \dots, x_{F_m} \in \text{ext}(C \cap U)$ (see Theorem 1). Consequently, we have $x_1 = x_{F_1} + p_{l_1}, \dots, x_m = x_{F_m} + p_{l_m}$ for some $p_{l_1}, \dots, p_{l_m} \in \text{lin } C$ and therefore $x = \lambda_1 x_{F_1} + \dots + \lambda_m x_{F_m} + \lambda_1 p_{l_1} + \dots + \lambda_m p_{l_m}$, namely $U \ni x - \lambda_1 x_{F_1} - \dots - \lambda_m x_{F_m} = \lambda_1 p_{l_1} + \dots + \lambda_m p_{l_m} \in \text{lin } C$, which shows that $\lambda_1 p_{l_1} + \dots + \lambda_m p_{l_m} \in U \cap (\text{lin } C) = \{0\}$ and therefore

$$x = \lambda_1 x_{F_1} + \dots + \lambda_m x_{F_m} \in \text{conv ext}(C \cap U).$$

Thus, the inclusion $C \cap U \subseteq \text{conv ext}(C \cap U)$ is now completely done, and the opposite inclusion is obvious. \square

Recall that the linearity of a l.s.c. proper convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is the linear subspace

$$\text{lin } f := \{d \in \mathbb{R}^n : f0^+(-d) = -f0^+(d)\}.$$

The subspace $\text{lin } f$ consists of those directions in which f is affine. By [8, Theorem 4.8], the recession function $f0^+$ is linear on $\text{lin } f$ and, in view of [8, Theorem 8.8], one has

$$\text{graph}(f0^+) \Big|_{\text{lin } f} = \text{lin epi } f. \quad (10)$$

Taking all this into account, one easily obtains the following corollary.

Corollary 18. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a l.s.c. proper convex function and U be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } f$. Then, f is a generalized Minkowski function if and only if $f|_U$ is a Minkowski function.*

In particular, f is a generalized Minkowski function if and only if $f|_{(\text{lin } f)^\perp}$ is a Minkowski function.

Proof. Observe first that $U \times \mathbb{R}$ is a supplementary subspace to $\text{graph}(f0^+) \Big|_{\text{lin } f}$. Hence, by (10) and the equality $(\text{epi } f) \cap (U \times \mathbb{R}) = \text{epi } f|_U$, it suffices to apply Theorem 17. \square

Another consequence of Theorem 17 is the next result.

Theorem 19. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set. Then, C is a generalized Minkowski set if and only if there exist a Minkowski set $C_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, a supplementary subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ to $\text{aff } C_0 - \text{aff } C_0$ and a linear subspace $L \subseteq V$ such that*

$$C = C_0 + L. \quad (11)$$

Corollary 20. *In particular, C is a generalized Minkowski set if and only if there exist a Minkowski set $C_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a linear subspace $L \subseteq (\text{aff } C_0 - \text{aff } C_0)^\perp$ such that*

$$C = C_0 + L.$$

Proof. If C is a generalized Minkowski set, then (11) holds with

$$C_0 := C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp, \quad V = (\text{aff } C_0 - \text{aff } C_0)^\perp \quad \text{and} \quad L := \text{lin } C.$$

Indeed, by Theorem 17, the set $C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$ is generalized Minkowski and, on the other hand, we have

$$\text{aff } (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) - \text{aff } (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) \subseteq (\text{lin } C)^\perp - (\text{lin } C)^\perp = (\text{lin } C)^\perp,$$

and hence $\text{lin } C = (\text{lin } C)^{\perp\perp} \subseteq (\text{aff } C_0 - \text{aff } C_0)^\perp$.

Conversely, assume that (11) holds for some Minkowski set $C_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, some supplementary subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ to $\text{aff } C_0 - \text{aff } C_0$ and some subspace $L \subseteq V$. By applying a translation if necessary, we assume, without loss of generality, that $0 \in C_0$. Then, $\text{aff } C_0 - \text{aff } C_0 = \text{aff } C_0$. We will now prove that

$$L \subseteq \text{lin } C \subseteq V. \quad (12)$$

The first inclusion being obvious, we will only prove the second one. To this aim, let $d \in \text{lin } C$. Denoting by π the projection mapping onto $\text{aff } C_0$ corresponding to the direct sum $V \oplus \text{aff } C_0 = \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\pi(d) \in \pi(\text{lin } C) \subseteq \text{lin } \pi(C) = \text{lin } C_0 = \{0\};$$

we have here used the equality $\pi(C) = C_0$. Thus, $\pi(d) = 0$, that is, $d \in V$, which completes the proof of (12). We deduce that $\text{lin } C \cap \text{aff } C_0 \subseteq V \cap \text{aff } C_0 = \{0\}$; consequently, $\text{aff } C_0 \subseteq U$ for some supplementary subspace U to $\text{lin } C$. We have $C \cap U = (C_0 + L) \cap U = C_0$, the latter equality being an easy consequence of the inclusions $C_0 \subseteq \text{aff } C_0 \subseteq U$ and $U \cap L \subseteq U \cap \text{aff } C_0 \subseteq U = \{0\}$. To complete the proof, it suffices to apply Theorem 17. \square

Remark 4.1. The condition that L is contained in a supplementary space to $\text{aff } C_0 - \text{aff } C_0$ is essential for the validity of the "if" statement of Theorem 19, as can be seen by considering, e.g., the case when C_0 is the convex hull of a parabola in \mathbb{R}^2 and L is the line through the origin orthogonal to the axis of the parabola.

Definition 4.2. A l.s.c. proper convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ which has a generalized Minkowski epigraph is called a *generalized Minkowski set*.

Let V be a subspace of \mathbb{R}^n . Recall that a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be V -invariant if $S + V = S$.

Remark 4.2. Let U be a supplementary subspace to V . One can easily prove the equivalence

$$S \text{ is } V\text{-invariant} \Leftrightarrow S \cap U + V = S.$$

Indeed, if S is V -invariant, then $S \cap U + V \subseteq S + V = S$, and, for the opposite inclusion, consider an element $s \in S$, use the direct sum decomposition

$$U \oplus V = \mathbb{R}^n$$

to write

$$s = s^U + s^V, \quad \text{with } s^U \in U \text{ and } s^V \in V, \quad (13)$$

and observe that

$$s^U = s - s^V \in S - V = S + V = S.$$

Conversely, if $S \cap U + V = S$ and $s \in S$ is decomposed as in (13), by the uniqueness of this decomposition one has $s^U \in S \cap U$, and hence

$$s + V = s^U + s^V + V = s^U + V \subseteq S \cap U + V = S,$$

which proves that $S + V = S$, as the inclusion \supseteq is obvious.

In particular, one has

$$S \text{ is } V\text{-invariant} \Leftrightarrow S \cap V^\perp + V = S.$$

Lemma 21. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$. If $S \subseteq C$ is a $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant set such that $\text{conv } S = C$, then

$$\text{conv}(S \cap U) = C \cap U. \quad (14)$$

In particular,

$$\text{conv}(S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) = C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp.$$

Proof. By Remark 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C \cap U + \text{lin } C &= C = \text{conv } S = \text{conv}(S \cap U + \text{lin } C) \\ &= \text{conv}(S \cap U) + \text{conv}(\text{lin } C) \\ &= \text{conv}(S \cap U) + \text{lin } C, \end{aligned}$$

and hence we obtain (14). \square

Lemma 22. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$. If $C \cap U$ is a Minkowski set, then

$$\text{conv } MF(C) = C.$$

Proof. By Corollary 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{conv } MF(C) &= \text{conv}(\text{ext}(C \cap U) + \text{lin } C) \\ &= \text{conv}(\text{ext}(C \cap U)) + \text{conv } \text{lin } C \\ &= C \cap U + \text{lin } C = C.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 23. *For a nonempty closed convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the following statements are equivalent:*

1. C is generalized Minkowski.
2. There exists a smallest $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant set $S \subseteq C$ such that $\text{conv } S = C$.
3. There exists a minimal $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant set $S \subseteq C$ such that $\text{conv } S = C$.

In 2 and 3, one has $S = MF(C)$.

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$. Since the closed convex set $C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$ is Minkowski, according to Theorem 17, it follows that $\text{ext}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)$ is, according to [4, Proposition 3.1], the smallest set whose convex hull equals $C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$. By Corollary 3, the set $MF(C)$ is $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant. Let $S \subseteq C$ be a $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant set such that $\text{conv } S = C$. From Lemma 21, it follows that

$$\text{ext}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) \subseteq S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp,$$

which, by Remark 4.2, implies that

$$MF(C) = \text{ext}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C \subseteq S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp + \text{lin } C = S.$$

Since, by Lemma 22, we have $\text{conv } MF(C) = C$, in view of (9) the set $MF(C)$ is the smallest $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant subset of C whose convex hull equals C .

$2 \Rightarrow 3$. Obvious.

$3 \Rightarrow 1$. By Lemma 21, we have $\text{conv}(S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) = C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$. We will actually prove that $S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$ is minimal among the $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant sets whose convex hulls equal $C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$. Indeed, if $\text{conv } S_1 = C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$ for some $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant set $S_1 \subseteq S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{conv}(S_1 + \text{lin } C) &= \text{conv } S_1 + \text{conv } \text{lin } C = C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp + \text{conv } \text{lin } C \\ &= C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp + \text{lin } C = C\end{aligned}$$

and $S_1 + \text{lin } C \subseteq S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp + \text{lin } C = S$. But since $S_1 + \text{lin } C$ is $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant and S is a minimal $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant set with $\text{conv } S = C$, it follows that $S_1 = S_1 + \text{lin } C = S$. Thus

$$S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp = S_1 \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp = S_1,$$

which proves the minimality of $S \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$. According to [4, Proposition 3.1], it follows that the set $C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$ is Minkowski; therefore, by Lemma 22, we have $\text{conv } MF(C) = C$. □

5 The role of the Pareto like sets in this setting

In [4], we paid some special attention to the closed convex sets $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ for which $M(C) = \text{rbd}(C)$, where $M(C)$ stands for the *Pareto like set* of C :

$$\begin{aligned} M(C) &:= \{x \in C : (x - 0^+C) \cap C \subseteq x + 0^+C\} \\ &= \{x \in C : (x - 0^+C) \cap C = x + \text{lin } C\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.1. ([4, Proposition 4.4]) If $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed convex set, then $M(C)$ is $(\text{lin } C)$ -invariant.

Theorem 24. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set with the property that $\dim(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) \geq 2$. If C is not an affine variety and $M(C) = \text{rbd } C$, then C is a generalized Minkowski set.*

In order to prove Theorem 24, we need the following lemmas. We will denote by π the projection mapping onto $(\text{lin } C)^\perp$.

Lemma 25. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$. If π_U denotes the projection mapping onto U corresponding to the direct sum decomposition $U \oplus \text{lin } C = \mathbb{R}^n$, then*

$$\pi_U(C) = C \cap U \tag{15}$$

and

$$C = \pi_U(C) + \text{lin } C. \tag{16}$$

In particular, if π denotes the orthogonal projection mapping onto $(\text{lin } C)^\perp$, then

$$\pi(C) = C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$$

and

$$C = \pi(C) + \text{lin } C.$$

Proof. Equality (15) is an immediate consequence of the decomposition

$$C = C \cap U + \text{lin } C, \tag{17}$$

since π_U is linear. Equality (16) follows from (17) and (15). \square

Corollary 26. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a supplementary subspace to $\text{lin } C$. If π_U denotes the projection mapping onto U corresponding to the direct sum decomposition $U \oplus \text{lin } C = \mathbb{R}^n$, then*

$$\pi_U^{-1}(\pi_U(C)) = C.$$

In particular, if π denotes the orthogonal projection mapping onto $(\text{lin } C)^\perp$, then

$$\pi^{-1}(\pi(C)) = C.$$

Proof. The inclusion \supseteq being obvious, we will only prove the opposite one. Let $x \in \pi_U^{-1}(\pi_U(C))$. Then, in view of (16), we have

$$x = \pi_U(x) + x - \pi_U(x) \in \pi_U(C) + \text{lin } C = C,$$

which proves the inclusion \subseteq . \square

Lemma 27. *If $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a nonempty closed convex set, then*

$$\text{aff}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) = (\text{aff } C) \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp \quad (18)$$

and

$$\text{rbd}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C = \text{rbd } C. \quad (19)$$

Proof. The inclusion \subseteq in (18) being obvious, we will only prove the opposite one. To this aim, let $x \in (\text{aff } C) \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp$. Since $x \in \text{aff } C$, it follows that

$$x = \lambda_1 x_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m x_m \quad (20)$$

for some $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_m = 1$ and some $x_1, \dots, x_m \in C$. Applying π to both sides of (20), we obtain

$$x = \lambda_1 \pi(x_1) + \cdots + \lambda_m \pi(x_m).$$

Thus, by Lemma 15, we have $x \in \text{aff}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)$, which completes the proof of the inclusion \supseteq in (18).

To prove the inclusion \supseteq in (19), let $x \in \text{rbd } C$ and, for $r > 0$, take

$$x_r \in B(x, r) \cap (\text{aff } C) \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus C).$$

By Corollary (26), we have $\pi(x_r) \notin C$; hence, since π is nonexpansive, using (18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(x_r) &\in B(\pi(x), r) \cap (\text{aff } C) \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus C) \\ &= B(\pi(x), r) \cap (\text{aff } C) \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)) \\ &= B(\pi(x), r) \cap \text{aff}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\pi(x) \in \text{rbd}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)$, from which we deduce that

$$x = \pi(x) + x - \pi(x) \in \text{rbd}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C,$$

as was to be proved.

To prove the inclusion \subseteq in (19), it suffices to prove that

$$\text{rbd}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) \subseteq \text{rbd } C, \quad (21)$$

since $\text{rbd } C + \text{lin } C = \text{rbd } C$ in view of [4, Proposition 4.6]. To see that (21) holds, just observe that, for every $x \in \text{rbd}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)$ and $r > 0$, using (18)

one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
& B(x, r) \cap (\text{aff } C) \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus C) \\
& \supseteq B(x, r) \cap (\text{aff } C) \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus C) \\
& = B(x, r) \cap (\text{aff } C) \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp \cap ((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp))) \\
& = B(x, r) \cap \text{aff } (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) \cap ((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp))) \neq \emptyset.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, from the inclusion (21), we deduce that

$$\text{rbd}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C \subseteq \text{rbd } C + \text{lin } C = \text{rbd } C,$$

the latter equality being due to [4, Proposition 4.6]. \square

The proof of Theorem 24. By using (19) and [4, Proposition 4.5], the hypothesis $M(C) = \text{rbd } C$ can be rewritten as

$$M(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C = \text{rbd } (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C.$$

From this inequality, taking into account that the sets $M(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)$ and $\text{rbd } (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp)$ are contained in $(\text{lin } C)^\perp$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
M(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) &= (M(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C) \cap \text{lin } C)^\perp \\
&= (\text{rbd}(C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp) + \text{lin } C) \cap \text{lin } C)^\perp \\
&= \text{rbd } (C \cap (\text{lin } C)^\perp).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe now that the assumption that C is not an affine variety is equivalent to the nonemptiness of $\text{rbd } C$, since $\text{aff } C$ is connected. Then, by using [4, Proposition 4.8] and Theorem 17, the statement follows immediately. \square

References

- [1] Barvinok, A., A Course in Convexity, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2002.
- [2] Borwein, J.M., Vanderwerff, J.D., Convex Functions: Constructions, Characterizations and Counterexamples, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [3] Goberna, M.A., Martínez-Legaz, J.E., Todorov, M. I., On Motzkin decomposable sets and functions, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 372, (2010) 525–537.
- [4] Martínez-Legaz, J.E., Pinteá, C., Closed convex sets of Minkowski type, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 444 (2016) 1195–1202.
- [5] Martínez-Legaz, J.E., Pinteá, C., Closed convex sets with an open or closed Gauss range, Math. Programming, 189 (2021) 433–454.

- [6] Minkowski, H., Theorie der konvexen Körper, insbesondere Begründung ihres Oberflächenbegriffs Gesammelte Ahhandlungen, vol. II Teubner, Leipzig (1911), 131–229.
- [7] Motzkin, Th., Beiträge zur Theorie der linearen Ungleichungen, Inaugural Dissertation 73 S., Basel, 1936.
- [8] Rockafellar, R.T., Convex Analysis, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1970.
- [9] Viro, O.Ya., Ivanov, O.A., Netsvetaev, N., Yu., Kharlamov, V.M., Elementary Topology. Problem textbok, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2008.
- [10] Webster, R., Convexity, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 1994.