



AD735837

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF WISCONSIN



MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER



Address:

Mathematics Research  
Center  
The University of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706  
U.S.A.

Reproduced by  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
Springfield, Va 22151

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN  
MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER

Contract No. : DA-31-124-ARO-D-462

NORMED CONVEX PROCESSES


Stephen M. Robinson

This document has been approved for public  
release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

MRC Technical Summary Report # 1135

November 1971

Received September 23, 1971



Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Security Classification		
DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D		
<i>(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)</i>		
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 53706		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <b>Unclassified</b>
		2b. GROUP <b>None</b>
3. REPORT TITLE <b>NORMED CONVEX PROCESSES</b>		
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) <b>Summary Report: no specific reporting period.</b>		
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name) <b>Stephen M. Robinson</b>		
6. REPORT DATE <b>November 1971</b>	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES <b>26</b>	7b. NO. OF REFS <b>10</b>
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. <b>Contract No. DA-31-124-ARO-D-462</b>	8b. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) <b>11 35</b>	
8c. PROJECT NO. <b>None</b>	8d. OTHER REPORT NUM(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report) <b>None</b>	
8e.		
8f.		
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT <b>Distribution of this document is unlimited.</b>		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES <b>None</b>		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY <b>Army Research Office-Durham, N. C.</b>
13. ABSTRACT <b>We show that several well-known results about continuous linear operators on Banach spaces can be generalized to the wider class of convex processes, as defined by Rockafellar. In particular, the open mapping theorem and the standard bound for the norm of the inverse of a perturbed linear operator can be extended to convex processes. In the last part of the paper, these theorems are exploited to prove results about the stability of solution sets of certain operator inequalities and equations in Banach spaces. These results yield quantitative bounds for the displacement of the solution sets under perturbations in the operators and/or in the right-hand sides. They generalize the standard results on stability of unique solutions of linear operator equations.</b>		

## ABSTRACT

We show that several well-known results about continuous linear operators on Banach spaces can be generalized to the wider class of convex processes, as defined by Rockafellar. In particular, the open mapping theorem and the standard bound for the norm of the inverse of a perturbed linear operator can be extended to convex processes. In the last part of the paper, these theorems are exploited to prove results about the stability of solution sets of certain operator inequalities and equations in Banach spaces. These results yield quantitative bounds for the displacement of the solution sets under perturbations in the operators and/or in the right-hand sides. They generalize the standard results on stability of unique solutions of linear operator equations.

## NORMED CONVEX PROCESSES

Stephen M. Robinson

1. Introduction. The idea of a convex process was introduced by Rockafellar [9,10] in connection with general studies in convexity. If  $X$  and  $Y$  are real linear spaces, a convex process from  $X$  into  $Y$  is a mapping of points in  $X$  into subsets of  $Y$ , whose graph is a convex cone in  $X \times Y$  containing the origin. If the graph is also closed, then we refer to a closed convex process. Here we are using the definition of graph as given in [10]: for a mapping  $T$ ,

$$\text{graph } T := \{(x, y) \mid y \in Tx\}.$$

An equivalent way of stating the above definition is to say that a mapping  $T$  is a convex process if it satisfies the following three requirements:

- a.  $T(x + z) \supset Tx + Tz$  for all  $x, z \in X$ .
- b.  $T(\lambda x) = \lambda Tx$  for every  $\lambda > 0$  and every  $x \in X$ .
- c.  $0 \in T0$ .

It is clear that any linear transformation (considered as a point-to-set mapping) is a convex process, but not vice versa. Just as with linear transformations, we can define the concepts of domain, range and inverse: for a convex process  $T$ ,  $\text{dom } T$  is the set of points  $x$  for which  $Tx \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\text{range } T$

is  $U\{Tx|x \in \text{dom } T\}$ , and  $T^{-1}$  is a mapping from range  $T$  onto  $\text{dom } T$  with  $T^{-1}y := \{x|y \in Tx\}$ . Note that  $\text{dom } T$  and range  $T$  are both convex cones containing  $0$ , since they are the projections of graph  $T$  into  $X$  and  $Y$  respectively. Finally, if  $X$  and  $Y$  are normed, we can define the norm of  $T$  by

$$\|T\| := \sup\{\inf\{\|y\| \mid y \in Tx\} \mid \|x\| \leq 1, x \in \text{dom } T\}.$$

The above definitions are taken from [9] and [10], except that the definition of  $\|T\|$  is changed slightly from that given in [9]; the change affects only the class of convex processes with domain  $\{0\}$ .

Note that there are some changes from the theory of linear operators: for one thing, every convex process has an inverse, and it is easy to see that the inverse is itself a convex process. On the other hand, any linear operator between finite-dimensional normed linear spaces has a finite norm, but this is no longer true for convex processes; an example of a closed convex process from  $\mathbb{R}^2$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  with infinite norm is given in Section 2.

We shall call a convex process normed if its norm is finite. In view of the example just cited, the question naturally arises: when is a convex process normed? Also, if a convex process is normed, when can we be sure that its inverse is also normed? Finally, if  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are normed, and if we perturb  $T$  slightly by adding to it another convex process of small norm, can anything be

said about the norm of the inverse of the perturbed process; specifically, can that norm be bounded? These are questions that often arise in applications, and in the case of linear operators on Banach spaces they can be answered in a very satisfactory manner.

In this paper we show how these and other questions can be answered for convex processes; in fact, several of the well-known results from the theory of linear operators can be extended to convex processes in very nearly the same form.

We conclude this section by explaining some notational conventions that we shall use in what follows. All linear spaces from this point on will be assumed to be over the real field. If two convex processes, say  $S$  and  $T$ , are defined from a linear space  $X$  into another linear space  $Y$ , then their sum,  $S + T$ , is the mapping defined by  $(S + T)(x) := Sx + Tx$ . If  $\lambda$  is a real number, then the mapping  $\lambda T$  is defined by  $(\lambda T)(x) := \lambda(Tx)$ . Both of these mappings are convex processes, and if  $S$  and  $T$  are normed, we have  $\|S + T\| \leq \|S\| + \|T\|$  and  $\|\lambda T\| = |\lambda| \|T\|$ . One can also define the composition of two convex processes in the obvious way, and show that  $\|UT\| \leq \|U\| \|T\|$ . The proofs of these results are omitted; they follow from the important fact that if  $T$  is any convex process and if  $x \in \text{dom } T$ , then for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there is (by the definition of  $\|T\|$ ) some  $y \in Tx$  with

$$\|y\| < \|T\| \|x\| + \epsilon .$$

Here and in what follows we are using the convention  $(+\infty) \cdot 0 = 0 = 0 \cdot (+\infty)$ .

2. Characterization of normed convex processes. In this section we first give an example, mentioned in the introduction, of a closed convex process with infinite norm; we then show that the class of convex processes having finite norms can be characterized in terms of two other equivalent topological properties.

The example is as follows: let  $T$  be the convex process from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  (the non-negative real numbers) into  $\mathbb{R}^2$  given by

$$Tx = \begin{cases} \{(y, z) \mid y^2 \leq zx \text{ and } 0 \leq z\} \text{ for } x \geq 0 \\ \emptyset \text{ for } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

For each  $x > 0$ , the image  $Tx$  is the area in the  $yz$ -plane on or above the parabola  $y^2 = zx$ ;  $T0$  is the non-negative  $z$ -axis. It is readily verified that this is a closed convex process with norm  $0$ .

However, the inverse process is given by

$$T^{-1}(y, z) = \begin{cases} \{x \mid x \geq y^2/z\} \text{ for } z > 0 \text{ and any } y \\ \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ for } z = 0, y = 0 \\ \emptyset \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and since for the pair  $(1, 1/n)$  we have  $T^{-1}(1, 1/n) = \{x \mid x \geq n\}$ , it is clear that the norm of  $T^{-1}$  must be  $+\infty$ .

Before stating the characterization theorem, we mention some topological preliminaries. If  $X$  and  $Y$  are topological vector spaces with  $X_0 \subset X$ , and if  $T$  is a mapping from  $X$  into  $Y$ , we say that  $T$



is lower semicontinuous at  $x_0 \in X_0$  as a mapping from  $X_0$  to  $Y$  if for each open set  $Q \subset Y$  with  $Q \cap Tx_0 \neq \emptyset$ , there is an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $x_0$  in  $X_0$  such that for every  $x \in U$ ,  $Q \cap Tx \neq \emptyset$  (see, e.g., [2]). We say that  $T$  is open at 0 if the image under  $T$  of any open neighborhood of 0 in  $X$  contains an open neighborhood of 0 in range  $T$ . When we speak of a neighborhood in a set we are, as usual, referring to the relative topology on that set.

THEOREM 1: Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be normed linear spaces, and let  $T$  be a convex process from  $X$  into  $Y$ . Then the following three properties are equivalent:

- a.  $T$  has a finite norm.
- b.  $T$  is lower semicontinuous at 0 as a mapping from  $\text{dom } T$  into  $Y$ .
- c.  $T^{-1}$  is open at 0.

PROOF (a  $\Rightarrow$  c): Denote the open ball of radius  $\epsilon > 0$  about  $x \in X$  by  $B(x, \epsilon)$ , and let  $C(y, \epsilon)$  be a similar ball about  $y \in Y$ . Let  $D(x, \epsilon) := B(x, \epsilon) \cap \text{dom } T$  and  $R(y, \epsilon) := C(y, \epsilon) \cap \text{range } T$ . Let  $V(0)$  be any open neighborhood of 0 in  $Y$ ; then  $T^{-1}[V(0)] = T^{-1}[V(0) \cap \text{range } T]$ . Pick some  $\eta > 0$  such that  $C(0, \eta) \subset V(0)$ ; then  $R(0, \eta) \subset V(0) \cap \text{range } T$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be so small that  $\|T\| \epsilon < \eta/2$ . Pick any  $x \in D(0, \epsilon)$ ; then there is some  $y \in Tx$  with  $\|y\| < \|T\| \epsilon + \eta/2 < \eta$ , so  $y \in R(0, \eta)$ . Since  $x$  was arbitrary, it follows that  $D(0, \epsilon) \subset T^{-1}[R(0, \eta)] \subset T^{-1}[V(0)]$ , so  $T^{-1}$  is open at 0.

(c  $\Rightarrow$  b): Suppose  $T^{-1}$  is open at 0; let  $Q \subset Y$  be open with  $Q \cap T0 \neq \emptyset$ . We have to find an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for each  $x \in D(0, \epsilon)$ , we have  $Q \cap Tx \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $q \in Q \cap T0$  and suppose  $C(q, \delta) \subset Q$  with  $\delta > 0$ . By the assumption, there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $T^{-1}[R(0, \delta)] \supset D(0, \epsilon)$ . But then for any  $x \in D(0, \epsilon)$  there is a  $y \in Tx \cap R(0, \delta)$ ; then  $Tx = T(0 + x) \supset T0 + Tx \ni q + y$ , and  $q + y \in C(q, \delta) \subset Q$ . Hence  $q + y \in Q \cap Tx \neq \emptyset$ , and so  $T$  is lower semicontinuous at 0 as a mapping from  $\text{dom } T$  into  $Y$ .

(b  $\Rightarrow$  a): Suppose  $T$  does not have a finite norm. Then we can find some sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset \text{dom } T$  with  $\|x_n\| \leq 1$  and  $\|y\| \geq n$  for all  $y \in Tx_n$  and for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . None of the  $x_n$  can be zero (since  $0 \in T0$ ), so we can define a new sequence  $\{z_n\} \subset \text{dom } T$  by setting  $z_n := x_n / (n \|x_n\|)$  for each  $n$ . It is clear that  $\|z_n\| = 1/n$  and  $\|y\| \geq 1$  for all  $y \in Tz_n$  and all  $n$ . Since  $0 \in T0$ , we have  $C(0, 1) \cap T0 \neq \emptyset$ ; however,  $C(0, 1) \cap Tz_n = \emptyset$  for each  $n$ . Since  $\{z_n\}$  converges to zero, it follows that  $T$  is not lower semicontinuous at 0 as a mapping from  $\text{dom } T$  into  $Y$ . This completes the proof.

3. Sufficient conditions for a finite norm. In Section 2 we found necessary and sufficient conditions for a convex process to have a finite norm. However, these conditions were stated in terms of topological properties of  $T$  which will frequently be just as hard to verify as will be the existence of a norm. In this section we develop some sufficient conditions of a simpler kind, which involve various properties of  $\text{dom } T$ .

**THEOREM 2 (Generalized Open Mapping Principle):** Let X and Y be Banach spaces, and let T be a closed convex process from X onto Y. Then the image under T of any open set in X is an open set in Y.

**PROOF:** Let the neighborhoods B, C, and D be defined as in the proof of Theorem 1. We shall first show that T is open at 0; the conclusion of the theorem then follows easily.

We have, since T is onto Y,

$$Y = T(\text{dom } T) = T\left[\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D(0, n)\right] = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} T[D(0, n)],$$

so by the Baire category theorem [ 5 ] there is some N such that

$\overline{T[D(0, N)]}$  contains an open ball in Y, say  $C(p, \eta)$ . By assumption there

is some  $x \in \text{dom } T$  with  $-p \in Tx$ . For any  $y \in C(0, \eta)$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we

can find some  $x' \in D(0, N)$  and  $z \in Tx'$  such that  $\|(p + y) - z\| < \epsilon$ ; then

$z - p \in Tx' + Tx \subset T(x' + x) \subset T[D(0, N + \|x\|)]$  and  $\|y - (z - p)\| =$

$\|(p + y) - z\| < \epsilon$ . Thus  $C(0, \eta) \subset \overline{T[D(0, N + \|x\|)]}$ , and if we define

$\delta := \eta/(N + \|x\|)$  it follows from the homogeneity of T that  $C(0, \delta)$

$\subset \overline{T[D(0, 1)]}$ , and in fact that  $C(0, 2^{-k} \delta) \subset \overline{T[D(0, 2^{-k})]}$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ .

Choose an arbitrary  $\bar{y} \in C(0, \delta/2)$ ; then by the last observation we can

find some  $x_1 \in D(0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $y_1 \in Tx_1$  such that  $\|\bar{y} - y_1\| < \delta/4$ . Suppose

that for some  $k \geq 1$  we have  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  with  $x_j \in D(0, 2^{-j})$

and  $y_j \in Tx_j$  for each j, and with  $\|\bar{y} - \sum_{j=1}^k y_j\| < 2^{-(k+1)} \delta$ . Then we can

find an  $x_{k+1} \in D(0, 2^{-(k+1)})$  and  $y_{k+1} \in Tx_{k+1}$  with

$$\left\| \left( \bar{y} - \sum_{j=1}^k y_j \right) - y_{k+1} \right\| = \left\| \bar{y} - \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} y_j \right\| < 2^{-(k+2)} \delta.$$

Hence, by induction we can construct sequences  $\{x_j\}$  and  $\{y_j\}$  having the stated properties for each  $j$ . Let  $w_k := \sum_{j=1}^k x_j$  and  $z_k := \sum_{j=1}^k y_j$  for

$k = 1, 2, \dots$ . It is easily seen that  $\{w_k\}$  is a Cauchy sequence and therefore must converge to some  $\bar{x}$  (since  $X$  is complete).

Also, by construction  $\{z_k\}$  converges to  $\bar{y}$ . We have for each  $k$ ,

$$Tw_k = T\left(\sum_{j=1}^k x_j\right) \ni \sum_{j=1}^k Tx_j \ni \sum_{j=1}^k y_j = z_k,$$

so the pair  $(w_k, z_k)$  belongs to the graph of  $T$ . Since  $T$  was assumed to

be a closed mapping, it follows that  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  also belongs to graph  $T$ ,

or in other words, that  $\bar{y} \in T\bar{x}$ . Thus  $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } T$ , and since for each  $j$ ,

$\|x_j\| < 2^{-j}$ , we must have  $\|\bar{x}\| < \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} = 1$ . Hence  $\bar{x} \in D(0, 1)$ , and

since  $\bar{y}$  was an arbitrary element of  $C(0, \delta/2)$  we have shown that

$T[D(0, 1)] \supset C(0, \delta/2)$ ; therefore  $T$  is open at  $0$ .

Now let  $Q$  be any open set in  $X$ . Let  $y$  be any point of  $T(Q)$ , and let  $x \in Q$  be such that  $y \in Tx$ . Choose  $\epsilon > 0$  so that  $B(x, \epsilon) \subset Q$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} T(Q) \cap T[B(x, \epsilon)] &= T[x + B(0, \epsilon)] \supset Tx + T[B(0, \epsilon)] \\ &= Tx + T[D(0, \epsilon)] \supset y + C(0, \delta\epsilon/2) = C(y, \delta\epsilon/2), \end{aligned}$$

so  $T(Q)$  must be open. This completes the proof.

COROLLARY (Generalized Closed Graph Theorem): Let X and Y be Banach spaces, and let T be a closed convex process from X into Y. If  $\text{dom } T = X$ , then T has a finite norm.

PROOF: The convex process  $T^{-1}$  takes Y onto X, and is closed since its graph is a reorientation of that of T. Applying Theorem 2 to  $T^{-1}$ , we conclude that  $T^{-1}$  is open at 0; it follows from Theorem 1 that T must then have a finite norm.

It is not true that if  $\text{dom } T = X$  and T has a finite norm, then graph T is closed. For example, the convex process from  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^2$  given by  $Tx := \{(y, z) \mid y > 0, z > 0\} \cup \{0, 0\}$  for each x, has domain  $\mathbb{R}$  and norm equal to zero, but its graph is not closed.

The following theorem is often useful in dealing with systems of linear equations and inequalities in finite-dimensional spaces.

THEOREM 3: Let X and Y be normed linear spaces, and let T be a convex process from X into Y. If  $\text{dom } T$  is the sum of a finite number of half-lines, then T has a finite norm.

PROOF: Let  $\text{dom } T$  be the sum of n half-lines. If  $n = 0$ , then  $\text{dom } T = \{0\}$  and it is easily seen that  $\|T\| = 0$ . Suppose then that  $n > 0$ , that there exist vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  with  $\|x_j\| = 1$  for each j, and that any  $x \in \text{dom } T$  is representable in the form  $x = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j x_j$  with each  $\lambda_j$

non-negative. Then  $\text{dom } T$  lies in the subspace V generated by  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ ,

and this subspace has dimension no higher than  $n$ . The restriction of the norm  $\| \cdot \|$  of  $X$  to  $V$  is a norm on  $V$ . Define a function  $f(x)$  on  $\text{dom } T$  by

$$f(x) := \inf \{ \|y\| \mid y \in Tx \}.$$

It is clear that  $f(x)$  has a finite value at each point of  $\text{dom } T$ ; in fact, as we shall see in the following argument, it is even convex there. Let  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  be any two points of  $\text{dom } T$ ; let  $\epsilon > 0$  be arbitrary, and pick  $y_1 \in Tx_1$  and  $y_2 \in Tx_2$  with  $\|y_1\| < f(x_1) + \epsilon$  and  $\|y_2\| < f(x_2) + \epsilon$ . For any  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  we have  $\lambda y_1 + (1-\lambda)y_2 \in \lambda Tx_1 + (1-\lambda)Tx_2 \subset T[\lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)x_2]$ , so  $f[\lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)x_2] \leq \|\lambda y_1 + (1-\lambda)y_2\| \leq \lambda \|y_1\| + (1-\lambda)\|y_2\| < \lambda [f(x_1) + \epsilon] + (1-\lambda)[f(x_2) + \epsilon] = \lambda f(x_1) + (1-\lambda)f(x_2) + \epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary, it follows that  $f(x)$  is convex on  $\text{dom } T$ .

Let  $\| \cdot \|_p$  be any polyhedral norm on  $V$  (that is, any norm whose closed unit ball  $\bar{B}_p$  is a polyhedron). Since  $\text{dom } T$ , being the sum of a finite number of half-lines, is a polyhedral convex cone [ 3 ], the intersection  $\bar{B}_p \cap \text{dom } T$  will be a polyhedron (nonempty, since  $0 \in \bar{B}_p \cap \text{dom } T$ ). Therefore  $f(x)$ , being convex, must attain its maximum at one of the extreme points of  $\bar{B}_p \cap \text{dom } T$ , so the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup \{ \inf \{ \|y\| \mid y \in Tx \} \mid \|x\|_p \leq 1, x \in \text{dom } T \} \\ &= \sup \{ f(x) \mid x \in \bar{B}_p \cap \text{dom } T \} \end{aligned}$$

is finite. However, since  $V$  is of finite dimension the norms  $\| \cdot \|$  and  $\| \cdot \|_p$  are equivalent on  $V$  [ 2 ], and thus

$$\|T\| := \sup \{ \inf \{ \|y\| \mid y \in Tx \} \mid \|x\| \leq 1, x \in \text{dom } T \}$$

is also finite. This completes the proof.

The next theorem is a partial converse to Theorem 3. In the theorem, we shall speak of an extreme half-line in a cone; this term is to be understood to mean a half-line (from 0) in the cone which is not the sum of any two distinct half-lines in the cone.

**THEOREM 4:** Let  $X$  be a normed linear space and let  $K$  be a convex cone containing the origin in  $X$ . If  $K$  contains an infinite number of extreme half-lines, then there is a convex process having domain  $K$  whose norm is  $+\infty$ .

**PROOF:** Let  $\{L_n\}$  be a sequence of extreme half-lines in  $K$ . Define a function  $g(x)$  on  $K$  as follows: if for some  $n$ ,  $x \in L_n$ , then  $g(x) := n \|x\|$ ; otherwise  $g(x) := 0$ . Let  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  be any two distinct points in  $K$ . If  $p_1, p_2$  and  $0$  are not collinear, then the "open" line segment  $(p_1, p_2)$  cannot contain any point lying on an extreme half-line, so  $g(x)$  is zero on the entire segment and hence convex on the closed segment  $[p_1, p_2]$ . If  $p_1, p_2$  and  $0$  are collinear, then by enumeration of cases  $g(x)$  is easily seen to be convex on  $[p_1, p_2]$ . Thus  $g(x)$  is a convex function on the cone  $K$ .

Now for  $x \in K$  define  $Tx := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid \lambda \geq g(x)\}$ , or in the notation of [9],  $Tx := g(x)^\vee$ . Since  $g$  is positively homogeneous and convex, with  $g(0) = 0$ , the epigraph [10] of  $g$  is a convex cone containing the origin; but this is also the graph of  $T$ , so  $T$  is a convex process with  $\text{dom } T = K$ . Consider the points  $x_n$  defined by  $x_n \in L_n$  and  $\|x_n\| = 1$ . For each  $n$  we have  $\inf \{\|y\| \mid y \in Tx_n\} = n$ , so it follows that  $\|T\| = +\infty$ , as was to have been shown.

4. Perturbation of a convex process. In this section we shall obtain bounds for the norm of the inverse of a perturbed convex process in terms of the norm of the inverse of the unperturbed process and the norm of the perturbing process, the latter being assumed to be small. These bounds will be applied in the following section to develop a stability theory for certain operator inequalities and equations. The results we shall obtain here generalize the well-known norm bounds for perturbations of a non-singular linear operator mapping a Banach space into itself.

If  $T$  is a convex process and  $K$  is a convex cone containing the origin, then we shall denote by  $T_K$  the restriction of  $T$  to  $K$ ; that is, the convex process defined by

$$T_K x := \begin{cases} Tx, & x \in K \\ \emptyset, & x \notin K. \end{cases}$$

THEOREM 5: Let  $X$  be a Banach space and  $Y$  be a normed linear space. Let  $T$  and  $\Delta$  be convex processes from  $X$  into  $Y$ ; denote  $\text{dom } T$  by  $K$  and  $\text{range } T$  by  $R$ . Assume that  $T, T^{-1}$ , and  $\Delta$  are normed, and that  $\|T^{-1}\| \|\Delta\| < 1$ . Suppose further that  $K \subset \text{dom } \Delta$ ,  $\Delta(K) \subset R$ ,  $K$  is closed, and  $(T-\Delta)(x)$  is closed for each  $x \in K$ .

Then the convex process  $T - \Delta$  has the following properties:

- a.  $\text{range } T \subset \text{range } (T - \Delta)$ .
- b.  $(T - \Delta)_R^{-1}$  is a normed convex process, and
 
$$\|(T - \Delta)_R^{-1}\| \leq \|T^{-1}\| / (1 - \|T^{-1}\| \|\Delta\|).$$



PROOF: Let  $\tau := \|T^{-1}\|$  and  $\delta := \|\Delta\|$ . Let  $\bar{y} \in \text{range } T$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  be chosen arbitrarily, and let  $\theta$  be any positive real number with  $\tau\delta \leq \theta < 1$ . We shall construct a Cauchy sequence  $\{x_k\}$  converging to a vector  $\bar{x} \in K$  with the property that  $\bar{y} \in (T - \Delta)\bar{x}$ , showing that  $\text{range } T \subset \text{range } (T - \Delta)$ , and with  $\|\bar{x}\| \leq \tau(1 - \theta)^{-1} \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon(1 - \theta)^{-1}$ . It will follow, upon letting  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$  and  $\theta \downarrow \tau\delta$ , that  $\|(T - \Delta)_R^{-1}\| \leq \tau/(1 - \tau\delta)$ . The number  $\theta$  is introduced in order to deal with the exceptional case in which  $\tau\delta = 0$ .

To construct the sequence  $\{x_k\}$  we proceed inductively, beginning with the choice  $x_0 = 0$ . Next, using the fact that  $\bar{y} \in \text{range } T$  and the definition of  $\tau$ , we choose  $x_1 \in K$  such that  $\bar{y} \in Tx_1$  and  $\|x_1\| \leq \tau \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon/2$ .

Then the following three statements hold:

1.  $x_1 - x_0 \in K$ .
2.  $\|x_1 - x_0\| \leq \tau\theta^0 \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon(1 - 2^{-1})\theta^0$ .
3.  $(Tx_1 - \bar{y}) \cap \Delta x_0 \neq \emptyset$  (it contains 0).

Now let  $k \geq 1$ , and suppose that  $x_{k-1}$  and  $x_k$  are given with  $x_{k-1}$  and  $x_k$  in  $K$  and the following conditions satisfied:

1.  $x_k - x_{k-1} \in K$ .
2.  $\|x_k - x_{k-1}\| \leq \tau\theta^{k-1} \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon(1 - 2^{-k})\theta^{k-1}$ .
3.  $(Tx_k - \bar{y}) \cap \Delta x_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$  be positive real numbers with the property that  $\tau\eta_1 + \eta_2 = \theta^k \epsilon / 2^{k+1}$ . Since  $x_k - x_{k-1} \in K$ , the set  $\Delta(x_k - x_{k-1})$  is nonempty; let

$z$  be a member of this set with  $\|z\| \leq \delta \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| + \eta_1$ . Next select

$w \in K$  such that  $z \in Tw$  and  $\|w\| \leq \tau \|z\| + \eta_2$ . Let  $x_{k+1} := x_k + w$ .

Clearly  $x_{k+1} - x_k \in K$ , and we have, using the second induction hypothesis and the definition of  $\eta_1$  and  $\eta_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+1} - x_k\| &\leq \tau \|z\| + \eta_2 \leq \tau \delta \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| + \tau \eta_1 + \eta_2 \\ &\leq \theta \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| + \theta^k \epsilon / 2^{k+1} \\ &\leq \tau \theta^k \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon (1 - 2^{-k}) \theta^k + \epsilon 2^{-(k+1)} \theta^k \\ &= \tau \theta^k \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon (1 - 2^{-(k+1)}) \theta^k. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let  $p$  be any member of the set  $(Tx_k - \bar{y}) \cap \Delta x_{k-1}$ , which was assumed to be nonempty. Then

$$p + z \in \Delta x_{k-1} + \Delta(x_k - x_{k-1}) \subset \Delta x_k,$$

and since  $w = x_{k+1} - x_k$ ,

$$p + z \in (Tx_k - \bar{y}) + T(x_{k+1} - x_k) \subset Tx_{k+1} - \bar{y},$$

so that the set  $(Tx_{k+1} - \bar{y}) \cap \Delta x_k$  is nonempty. Thus, by induction the properties (1), (2), and (3) must hold for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . We therefore have for  $m \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{k+m} - x_k\| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \|x_{k+j+1} - x_{k+j}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} [\tau \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon (1 - 2^{-(k+j+1)})] \theta^{k+j} \\ &\leq (\tau \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon) \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \theta^{k+j} \\ &= \theta^k (\tau \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon) (1 - \theta^m) / (1 - \theta), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and the latter quantity converges to zero as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , regardless of  $m$ . Thus  $\{x^k\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. For each  $k$ ,  $x_k = x_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (x_{j+1} - x_j)$ , a finite sum of terms in  $K$ ; hence  $\{x_k\} \subset K$ . Since  $X$  is a Banach space and  $K$  was assumed to be closed, the sequence  $\{x_k\}$  converges to some  $\bar{x} \in K$ .

Now choose an arbitrary  $\delta > 0$ , and let  $k$  be so large that we have  $\max [(\|T\| + \|\Delta\|) \|\bar{x} - x_k\|, \|\Delta\| \|x_k - x_{k-1}\|] < \delta/4$ . Since  $\bar{x} - x_k$  is the limit of the sequence  $\{x_{k+j} - x_k\}$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , and since for each  $j$ ,

$x_{k+j} - x_k = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (x_{k+i+1} - x_{k+i}) \in K$ , the point  $\bar{x} - x_k$  lies in  $K$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (T - \Delta)(\bar{x}) - \bar{y} &\supset (T - \Delta)(\bar{x} - x_k) + (T - \Delta)(x_k) - \bar{y} \\ &\supset (T - \Delta)(\bar{x} - x_k) + \{[Tx_k - \bar{y}] - \Delta x_{k-1}\} - \Delta(x_k - x_{k-1}) \\ &\supset (T - \Delta)(\bar{x} - x_k) - \Delta(x_k - x_{k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

the last inclusion following since  $0 \in (Tx_k - \bar{y}) - \Delta x_{k-1}$  by property (3) of the induction. As noted in Section 1, we have  $\|T - \Delta\| \leq \|T\| + \|\Delta\|$ , so we can select  $z_1 \in (T - \Delta)(\bar{x} - x_k)$  with  $\|z_1\| < (\|T\| + \|\Delta\|) \|\bar{x} - x_k\| + \delta/4 < \delta/2$ , and  $z_2 \in -\Delta(x_k - x_{k-1})$  with  $\|z_2\| < \|\Delta\| \|x_k - x_{k-1}\| + \delta/4 < \delta/2$ . Therefore  $z_1 + z_2 \in (T - \Delta)(\bar{x}) - \bar{y}$  with  $\|z_1 + z_2\| < \delta$ , but since  $\delta$  was arbitrary and  $(T - \Delta)\bar{x}$  was assumed to be closed, we must have  $\bar{y} \in (T - \Delta)\bar{x}$ . Since  $\bar{y}$  was an arbitrary element of range  $T$ , we have  $\text{range } T \subset \text{range } (T - \Delta)$ .

Taking  $k = 0$  and letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  in (1), we obtain

$$\|\bar{x}\| = \|\bar{x} - x_0\| \leq (\tau \|\bar{y}\| + \epsilon)/(1 - \theta). \text{ Since } \epsilon \text{ was arbitrary, we have}$$

$\inf \{ \|x\| \mid \bar{y} \in (T - \Delta)x \} \leq [\tau/(1 - \theta)] \|\bar{y}\|$ , and since  $\bar{y}$  was any element of range  $T$ , we see that  $\|(T - \Delta)_R^{-1}\| \leq \tau/(1 - \theta)$ .

Letting  $\theta \downarrow \tau\delta$ , we obtain  $\|(T - \Delta)_R^{-1}\| \leq \tau/(1 - \tau\delta)$ , as was to have been shown.

It is not difficult to see that the conclusion of this theorem fails if the process  $(T - \Delta)^{-1}$  is not restricted to range  $T$ . For example, if  $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$  with the  $\ell_\infty$  norm, and if we set

$$Tx := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x \right\}$$

and

$$\Delta x := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} .5 & 0 \\ 0 & -.1 \end{bmatrix} x \right\}$$

for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , then  $\|T\| = \|T^{-1}\| = 1$ ,  $\|\Delta\| = \frac{1}{2}$ , but  $\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\| = 10$ . However,  $\|(T - \Delta)_R^{-1}\| = 2$ , as stated in the theorem.

For the case in which  $T$  and  $\Delta$  are continuous linear operators from a Banach space into itself with  $T$  and  $T - \Delta$  invertible, we can obtain also a lower bound for  $\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\|$ , namely:

$$\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\| \geq \|T^{-1}\|/(1 + \|T^{-1}\| \|\Delta\|). \quad (2)$$

However, this inequality is generally false for convex processes. For example, let  $X=Y=\mathbb{R}$ , and let  $T$  be the identity mapping on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be defined by  $\Delta x := \mathbb{R}$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\|T\| = \|T^{-1}\| = 1$ ,

but  $\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\| = 0$ , so the inequality (2) does not hold. In order to be able to prove that (2) is valid, we require additional conditions. We have followed Rockafellar [10] in denoting by  $0^+ S$  the recession cone of a convex set  $S$ : that is, the cone made up of all points  $x$  with the property that  $x + S \subset S$ . Intuitively, this is the "set of directions in which  $S$  is unbounded."

To establish (2), we first note that if  $\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\| = +\infty$  there is nothing to prove, and that if  $\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\| \|\Delta\| \geq 1$  the inequality follows from

$$\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\| \geq \|T^{-1}\| (1 - \|\Delta\| \|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\|), \quad (3)$$

which is equivalent to (2). We need therefore be concerned only with the case in which  $\|(T - \Delta)^{-1}\| \|\Delta\| < 1$ . If we now assume that for each  $x \in \text{dom } T \cap \text{dom } \Delta$ , we have

$$(\Delta - \Delta)x \subset 0^+ Tx, \quad (4)$$

it follows that for each such  $x$ ,  $(T - \Delta)x - (-\Delta)x \subset Tx$ ; but since  $0 \in (\Delta - \Delta)x$ , the reverse inclusion is trivial. Therefore we have

$$(T - \Delta) - (-\Delta) = T,$$

and now by making the assumptions necessary to apply Theorem 5 to  $T - \Delta$  and  $-\Delta$ , and by assuming that  $T - \Delta$  is onto, we can establish (3), from which (2) follows.

We remark that (4) is always satisfied when  $\Delta$  is a single-valued function.

5. Action of a convex process on sets. In this section we examine the following question: if two sets P and Q are "close" to each other (in a sense to be made precise), and if these sets are mapped by a convex process T into sets TP and TQ, then how "close" to each other are TP and TQ?

We first consider a measure of the distance between two sets. If Z is a normed linear space, we define for any  $z \in Z$  and any nonempty subset  $A \subset Z$ ,

$$d(z, A) := \inf\{\|z-a\| \mid a \in A\}.$$

For any nonempty set  $B \subset Z$ , define

$$d(B, A) := \sup\{d(b, A) \mid b \in B\}.$$

If we now let

$$\rho(A, B) := \max\{d(A, B), d(B, A)\},$$

then  $\rho$  is a generalized pseudo-metric on the family of nonempty subsets of Z; that is, a pseudo-metric [6] which may assume the value  $+\infty$ . If A and B are required to be closed, then  $\rho$  is the Hausdorff metric [2].

THEOREM 6: Let X and Y be normed linear spaces. Let P and Q be nonempty subsets of X, and let T be a normed convex process from X into Y, with TP and TQ nonempty.

a. If  $Q-P \subset \text{dom } T$ , then

$$d(TP, TQ) \leq \|T\| d(P, Q).$$

b. If  $(Q-P) \cup (P-Q) \subset \text{dom } T$ , then

$$\rho(TP, TQ) \leq \|T\| \rho(P, Q).$$

PROOF: We shall prove (a.); (b.) then follows by symmetry.

Choose  $\epsilon > 0$ , and let  $y$  be any point in  $TP$ . Let  $p \in P$  be such that  $y \in Tp$ , and find some  $q \in Q$  with  $\|T\| \|p-q\| < \|T\| d(P, Q) + \epsilon/2$ .

Since  $Q-P \subset \text{dom } T$ , there is some  $y' \in T(q-p)$  with

$$\|y'\| < \|T\| \|q-p\| + \epsilon/2.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} Tq - y &\supset T(q-p) + Tp - y \\ &\ni y' + y - y = y' \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|y'\| < \|T\| \|q-p\| + \epsilon/2 < \|T\| d(P, Q) + \epsilon.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, TQ) &:= \inf\{\|z-y\| \mid z \in TQ\} \\ &= \inf\{\|w\| \mid w \in TQ - y\} \\ &< \|T\| d(P, Q) + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and since  $y$  was any element of  $TP$ , we have  $d(TP, TQ) < \|T\| d(P, Q) + \epsilon$ .

But  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary, so the result follows. This completes the proof.

If the conditions on the difference of  $Q$  and  $P$  are not satisfied, then the conclusions of Theorem 6 can fail to hold. This can be seen by considering the following example: define a convex process  $T$  from  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (with the  $l_\infty$  norm) into  $\mathbb{R}$  by:

$$T(x, y) := \begin{cases} \{z \mid z \geq 0\} & \text{for } y > 0 \\ \{z \mid z \geq |x|\} & \text{for } y = 0 \\ \emptyset & \text{for } y < 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that  $\|T\| = 1$ . However, for any  $\epsilon > 0$  we have  $d[T(1, \epsilon), T(1, 0)] = 1$ , although  $d[(1, \epsilon), (1, 0)] = |\epsilon|$ , so that the conclusions of Theorem 6 do not hold. In this case, the difficulty arises from the fact that  $(0, -\epsilon)$  is not in  $\text{dom } T$  for  $\epsilon > 0$ .

6. Stability of solution sets of certain systems. Suppose that we are given three Banach spaces  $X$ ,  $Y$ , and  $Z$ , and that  $Y$  contains a nonempty closed convex cone  $K$  which induces on  $Y$  a partial ordering denoted by  $\leq$ . Let  $A$  be a function from  $X$  into  $Y$  which is convex with respect to  $K$  on all of  $X$  and is closed and positively homogeneous of degree 1; that is,  $\text{epi } A$  is closed in  $X \times Y$  and for each real  $\lambda \geq 0$  and each  $x \in X$  we have  $A(\lambda x) = \lambda Ax$ . In particular,  $A$  could be a continuous linear operator. Let  $\Delta_A$ ,  $C$ , and  $\Delta_C$  be continuous linear operators from  $X$  into  $Y$ ,  $Z$ , and  $Z$  respectively. Suppose  $b$  and  $\Delta_b$  are points in  $Y$ , and  $d$  and  $\Delta_d$  are points in  $Z$ . We shall consider the following two questions:

a. Suppose  $x$  is a solution of the system

$$\begin{aligned} Aw &\leq b \\ Cw &= d. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Is there any  $\hat{x} \in X$  such that  $\hat{x}$  solves the system



$$\begin{aligned} (A + \Delta_A)w &\leq b + \Delta_b \\ (C + \Delta_C)w &= d + \Delta_d, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

and if so how small can  $\|x - \hat{x}\|$  be made; i.e., how close to  $x$  is there a solution of (6)?

b. Suppose  $\hat{x}$  solves (6). If (5) is known to be solvable, how close is  $\hat{x}$  to the set of solutions of (5)?

Question (a.) is one that frequently arises in such areas as the analysis of convergence for iterative processes (see, e.g., [8]).

Question (b.) formulates the fundamental problem of determining error bounds for the approximate solution of certain systems (including linear systems). We shall see that both questions can be answered in a convenient way by applying Theorem 6 and some of our previous results.

**THEOREM 7:** Let  $X$ ,  $Y$  and  $Z$  be Banach spaces, and let  $K$  be a nonempty closed convex cone in  $Y$ . Let the partial ordering induced on  $Y$  by  $K$  be denoted by  $\leq$ . Let  $A$ ,  $\Delta_A$ ,  $C$ ,  $\Delta_C$ ,  $b$ ,  $\Delta_b$ ,  $d$  and  $\Delta_d$  be as previously stated. Define a multivalued mapping from  $X$  into  $Y \times Z$  by

$$Tx := \{(y, z) \mid Ax \leq y, Cx = z\}$$

and a linear operator from  $X$  into  $Y \times Z$  by

$$\Delta x := \{(\Delta_A x, \Delta_C x)\}.$$

Let  $Y \times Z$  be normed by defining  $\|(y, z)\| := \max(\|y\|, \|z\|)$ , where

the norms on the right are those of the spaces Y and Z respectively.

Suppose the mapping T carries X onto Y x Z. Then T, T<sup>-1</sup>, and Δ are normed convex processes, and we have:

a. If  $\hat{x}$  solves (6), then

$$\inf\{\|\hat{x}-x\| \mid x \text{ solves (5)}\} \leq \|T^{-1}\| (\|(\Delta_b, \Delta_d)\| + \|\Delta\| \|\hat{x}\|).$$

b. If  $\bar{x}$  solves (5) and  $\|\Delta\| \|T^{-1}\| < 1$ , then (6) is solvable

and we have

$$\inf\{\|\bar{x}-x\| \mid x \text{ solves (6)}\} \leq \|T^{-1}\| (\|(\Delta_b, \Delta_d)\| + \|\Delta\| \|\bar{x}\|)/(1 - \|\Delta\| \|T^{-1}\|).$$

PROOF: It is a fairly routine matter to show that  $Y \times Z$  is a Banach space under the given norm, and that its topology is in fact the product topology on  $Y \times Z$ . The assertion that  $T$ ,  $T^{-1}$ , and  $\Delta$  are convex processes is easily proved by referring to the definition of a convex process, and the fact that  $\Delta$  is normed follows from the continuity (thus boundedness) of  $\Delta_A$  and  $\Delta_C$ ; indeed, we have  $\|\Delta\| = \max(\|\Delta_A\|, \|\Delta_C\|)$ . The assumption that  $\text{epi } A$  was closed, and the continuity of  $C$ , imply that graph  $T$  is closed in  $X \times Y \times Z$ ; hence  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are closed convex processes. Since  $\text{dom } T = X$  and  $\text{dom } T^{-1} = \text{range } T = Y \times Z$ , it follows from the corollary to Theorem 2 that  $T$  and  $T^{-1}$  are normed.

For part (a.), we rewrite (6) with  $w = \hat{x}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A\hat{x} &\leq b + \Delta_b - \Delta_A \hat{x} \\ C\hat{x} &= d + \Delta_d - \Delta_C \hat{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\hat{x} \in T^{-1}[(b, d) + (\Delta_b, \Delta_d) - \Delta \hat{x}],$$

and since the set of points  $x$  solving (5) is  $T^{-1}[(b, d)]$ , we may

apply Theorem 6 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \inf\{\|\hat{x}-x\| \mid x \text{ solves (5)}\} &= d(\hat{x}, T^{-1}[(b, d)]) \\ &\leq d(T^{-1}[(b, d) + (\Delta_b, \Delta_d) - \Delta \hat{x}], T^{-1}[(b, d)]) \\ &\leq \|T^{-1}\| \|(\Delta_b, \Delta_d) - \Delta \hat{x}\| \\ &\leq \|T^{-1}\| (\|(\Delta_b, \Delta_d)\| + \|\Delta\| \|\hat{x}\|). \end{aligned}$$

This proves part (a.).

To prove part (b.), we shall apply Theorem 5 to the convex process  $T + \Delta = T - (-\Delta)$ . We observe that  $\text{dom}(-\Delta) = \text{dom } T = X$ , which is closed; also  $-\Delta(X) \subset Y \times Z = \text{range } T$ . We showed earlier in the proof that  $T^{-1}$  was normed, and we had by hypothesis that  $\|T^{-1}\| \|\Delta\| = \|T^{-1}\| \|\Delta\| < 1$ . Finally, for each  $x \in X$  the set  $(T + \Delta)x$  is  $\{Ax + \Delta_A x + K\} \times \{Cx + \Delta_C x\}$ , which is a closed set in  $Y \times Z$ .

We now apply Theorem 5, and conclude that  $\text{range}(T + \Delta) = Y \times Z$ , so that (6) is solvable for any right-hand side. Also, we have

$$\|(T + \Delta)^{-1}\| \leq \|T^{-1}\| / (1 - \|T^{-1}\| \|\Delta\|);$$

no restriction of  $(T + \Delta)^{-1}$  is necessary, since  $T$  was onto  $Y \times Z$ .

Rewriting (5) with  $w = \bar{x}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (A + \Delta_A)\bar{x} &\leq b + \Delta_A \bar{x} \\ (C + \Delta_C)\bar{x} &= d + \Delta_C \bar{x}; \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\bar{x} \in (T + \Delta)^{-1} [(b, d) + \Delta \bar{x}].$$

Reasoning as we did in part (a.), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \{ \|\bar{x} - x\| \mid x \text{ solves (6)} \} &= d(\bar{x}, (T + \Delta)^{-1} [(b, d) + (\Delta_b, \Delta_d)]) \\ &\leq \|(T + \Delta)^{-1}\| \|(\Delta_b, \Delta_d) - \Delta \bar{x}\| \\ &\leq \|T^{-1}\| (\|(\Delta_b, \Delta_d)\| + \|\Delta\| \|\bar{x}\|) / (1 - \|T^{-1}\| \|\Delta\|), \end{aligned}$$

as was to have been shown.

If the space  $X$  is reflexive, then the infima in the conclusions of Theorem 7 are actually attained, since the norm is weakly lower semicontinuous. If all spaces involved are finite-dimensional, and if  $A$  is taken to be linear, then a result similar to part (a.) can be proved with no assumptions at all about the ranges of  $A$  and  $C$ . This type of result was apparently first proved by Hoffman [4]; see [7] for a treatment using the methods of the present paper, with applications to linear programming, and [8] for an application to Newton's method. A theorem similar to part (b.) of Theorem 7 (again with  $A$  assumed to be linear) was proved for finite-dimensional spaces in [8]; also, Ben-Israel proved analogous perturbation results for generalized inverses in finite-dimensional spaces in [1].

The results of Theorem 7 are expressed in terms of the quantity  $\|T^{-1}\|$ , defined in this case to be

$$\sup \{ \inf \{ \|x\| \mid Ax \leq y, Cx = z \} \mid \|(y, z)\| \leq 1 \}. \quad (7)$$

## REFERENCES

1. A. Ben-Israel: On Error Bounds for Generalized Inverses.  
SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 3, 585-592 (1966).
2. G. Berge: Topological Spaces. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
3. D. Gale: The Theory of Linear Economic Models. New York:  
McGraw-Hill, 1960.
4. A. J. Hoffman: On Approximate Solutions of Linear Inequalities.  
J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards 49, 263-265 (1952).
5. L. V. Kantorovich and G. P. Akilov: Functional Analysis in  
Normed Spaces. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
6. J. L. Kelley: General Topology. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1955.
7. S. M. Robinson: Bounds for Error in the Solution Set of a  
Perturbed Linear Program. To appear in Lin. Alg. Appl. (1972).  
An earlier version appeared as Technical Summary Report No. 1134,  
Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin, 1971.
8. \_\_\_\_\_: Extension of Newton's Method to Mixed Systems  
of Nonlinear Equations and inequalities. Technical Summary Report No.  
1161, Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin, 1971.
9. R. T. Rockafellar: Monotone Processes of Convex and Concave Type.  
Providence: American Mathematical Society (AMS Memoir No. 77), 1967.
10. \_\_\_\_\_: Convex Analysis. Princeton: Princeton  
University Press, 1970.

Even in the finite-dimensional case, this quantity can be rather difficult to compute. It would be very desirable to have efficient computational methods for evaluating (7), both in the finite-dimensional and infinite-dimensional cases.

Acknowledgement. I should like to thank Lynn McLinden, who read the manuscript of this paper and suggested many improvements.

Mathematics Research Center

NORMED CONVEX PROCESSES

Stephen M. Robinson

UNCLASSIFIED

Convex processes

Linear inequalities

MRC Report No. 1135 AD

Contract No. : DA-31-124-ARO-D-462

26 pp.

November 1971

We show that several well-known results about continuous linear operators on Banach spaces can be generalized to the wider class of convex processes, as defined by Rockafellar. In particular, the open mapping theorem and the standard bound for the norm of the inverse of a linear operator can be extended to convex processes.

Mathematics Research Center

NORMED CONVEX PROCESSES

Stephen M. Robinson

UNCLASSIFIED

Convex processes

Linear inequalities

MRC Report No. 1135 AD

Contract No. : DA-31-124-ARO-D-462

26 pp.

November 1971

We show that several well-known results about continuous linear operators on Banach spaces can be generalized to the wider class of convex processes, as defined by Rockafellar. In particular, the open mapping theorem and the standard bound for the norm of the inverse of a linear operator can be extended to convex processes.

Mathematics Research Center

NORMED CONVEX PROCESSES

Stephen M. Robinson

UNCLASSIFIED

Convex processes

Linear inequalities

MRC Report No. 1135 AD

Contract No. : DA-31-124-ARO-D-462

26 pp.

November 1971

We show that several well-known results about continuous linear operators on Banach spaces can be generalized to the wider class of convex processes, as defined by Rockafellar. In particular, the open mapping theorem and the standard bound for the norm of the inverse of a linear operator can be extended to convex processes.

Mathematics Research Center

NORMED CONVEX PROCESSES

Stephen M. Robinson

UNCLASSIFIED

Convex processes

Linear inequalities

MRC Report No. 1135 AD

Contract No. : DA-31-124-ARO-D-462

26 pp.

November 1971

We show that several well-known results about continuous linear operators on Banach spaces can be generalized to the wider class of convex processes, as defined by Rockafellar. In particular, the open mapping theorem and the standard bound for the norm of the inverse of a linear operator can be extended to convex processes.