

Topological Properties of Convex Sets

DAISUKE OYAMA

Faculty of Economics, University of Tokyo

oyama@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp

This version: April 19, 2023

This document collects some useful topological properties of convex sets. Proofs are mostly from Rockafellar (1970).

Proposition 1. *For any convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, if $x \in \text{int } C$ and $y \in \text{cl } C$, then $(1 - \lambda)x + \lambda y \in \text{int } C$ for any $\lambda \in [0, 1)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \text{int } C$ and $y \in \text{cl } C$. Fix any $\lambda \in [0, 1)$. We want to show that there exists $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that $(1 - \lambda)x + \lambda y + \bar{\varepsilon}u \in C$ for all $u \in B$, where B is the unit open ball in \mathbb{R}^N around 0.

Since $x \in \text{int } C$, we can take an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $x + \varepsilon_0 u \in C$ for all $u \in B$. Given this $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, let $\bar{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon_0(1 - \lambda)/(1 + \lambda) > 0$. Since $y \in \text{cl } C$, we can take $u_0 \in B$ such that $y - \bar{\varepsilon}u_0 \in C$.

Fix any $u \in B$. Let $u' = [\lambda/(1 + \lambda)]u_0 + [1/(1 + \lambda)]u$, where $u' \in B$ by the convexity of B . Then, $(1 - \lambda)x + \lambda y + \bar{\varepsilon}u$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda y + \bar{\varepsilon}u &= (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda(y - \bar{\varepsilon}u_0) + \lambda\bar{\varepsilon}u_0 + \bar{\varepsilon}u \\ &= (1 - \lambda) \left(x + \frac{\lambda\bar{\varepsilon}}{1 - \lambda}u_0 + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{1 - \lambda}u \right) + \lambda(y - \bar{\varepsilon}u_0) \\ &= (1 - \lambda)(x + \varepsilon_0 u') + \lambda(y - \bar{\varepsilon}u_0) \end{aligned}$$

(note that $\bar{\varepsilon}\lambda/(1 - \lambda) = \varepsilon_0\lambda/(1 + \lambda)$, $\bar{\varepsilon}/(1 - \lambda) = \varepsilon_0/(1 + \lambda)$ by the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$). Since $x + \varepsilon_0 u' \in C$ by the choice of ε_0 , we have $(1 - \lambda)(x + \varepsilon_0 u') + \lambda(y - \bar{\varepsilon}u_0) \in C$ by the convexity of C . ■

Proposition 2. *For any convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $\text{cl } C$ and $\text{int } C$ are convex.*

Proof. The convexity of $\text{cl } C$ follows from the formula $\text{cl } C = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} (C + \varepsilon B)$ (where B is the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^N around 0, which is convex). The convexity of $\text{int } C$ follows from Proposition 1. ■

For $x^0, \dots, x^m \in \mathbb{R}^N$, write

$$\text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\}) = \{x^0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i(x^i - x^0) \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

which is called the affine space spanned by x^0, \dots, x^m , or the affine hull of x^0, \dots, x^m .

Proposition 3. For $x^0, \dots, x^m \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})$ is a closed set.

Proof. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \ell}$ consist of a maximal linearly independent subset of $\{x^1 - x^0, \dots, x^m - x^0\}$ (as columns). Take any sequence $\{x^k\}$ in $\text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})$, where for each k , $x^k = x^0 + A\lambda^k$ for some $\lambda^k \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, and assume that $x^k \rightarrow x^*$. We have $A^T(x^k - x^0) = A^T A\lambda^k$, where $A^T A$ is non-singular. To see this, let $A^T A z = 0$. Then we have $z^T A^T A z = 0$, or $\|Az\|^2 = 0$, which holds only if $Az = 0$. Since the columns of A are linearly independent, this holds only if $z = 0$.

Thus, we have $\lambda^k = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T (x^k - x^0)$. Then letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\lambda^k \rightarrow \lambda^* = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T (x^* - x^0)$. Hence, we have $x^* = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (x^0 + A\lambda^k) = x^0 + A\lambda^* \in \text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})$. This proves that $\text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})$ is closed. ■

A finite set $\{x^0, \dots, x^m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is *affinely independent* if $\{x^1 - x^0, \dots, x^m - x^0\}$ is linearly independent. The *dimension* of $C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, denoted $\dim C$, is the largest number m such that C contains some affinely independent set $\{x^0, \dots, x^m\}$. If $\{x^0, \dots, x^m\}$ is affinely independent, then $\dim(\text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})) = m$.

Proposition 4. Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$.

- (1) $\dim(\text{cl } C) = \dim C$.
- (2) If $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$, then $\dim C = N$.
- (3) Suppose that C is convex. If $\dim C = N$, then $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. (1) Let $\{x^0, \dots, x^m\}$ be a maximal affinely independent subset of C . By maximality, $C \subset \text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})$, and by the closedness of $\text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})$, $\text{cl } C \subset \text{aff}(\{x^0, \dots, x^m\})$. This implies that $\dim(\text{cl } C) \leq m = \dim C$. The converse inequality holds obviously.

(2) Suppose that $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$, and let $x^0 \in \text{int } C$. We can take an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $x^0 + \varepsilon e^i \in C$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, where e^i is the i th unit vector of \mathbb{R}^N , and $\{x^0, x^0 + \varepsilon e^1, \dots, x^0 + \varepsilon e^N\}$ is affinely independent. Hence, $\dim C = N$.

(3) Suppose that C is convex and $\dim C = N$. Let $\{x^0, \dots, x^N\} \subset C$ be affinely independent, and let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ consist of $x^1 - x^0, \dots, x^N - x^0$ (as columns), where A is invertible. Denote $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_i > 0, \sum_{i=1}^N x_i < 1\}$, which is nonempty and open. Then $\{x^0 + \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (x^i - x^0) \mid \lambda_i > 0, \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i < 1\} = \{x^0\} + A(S)$ is nonempty and open and is contained in C . Hence, $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$. ■

Proposition 5. For any convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, if $\text{int}(\text{cl } C) \neq \emptyset$, then $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. By Proposition 4,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{int}(\text{cl } C) \neq \emptyset &\implies \dim(\text{cl } C) = N \\ &\implies \dim C = N \\ &\implies \text{int } C \neq \emptyset, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. ■

Proposition 6. For any convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $\text{int}(\text{cl } C) = \text{int } C$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $\text{int}(\text{cl } C) \subset \text{int } C$. Suppose that $\text{int}(\text{cl } C) \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise the conclusion holds trivially). Then, by the convexity of C , it follows from Proposition 5 that $\text{int } C \neq \emptyset$. Let $z \in \text{int}(\text{cl } C)$. We want to show that $z \in \text{int } C$. Take any $x \in \text{int } C$ ($\neq \emptyset$). Suppose that $x \neq z$ (otherwise $z \in \text{int } C$ holds trivially). For $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$y = z - \varepsilon(x - z),$$

and let ε be sufficiently small so that $y \in \text{cl } C$. Then z can be written as $z = [1 - 1/(1 + \varepsilon)]x + [1/(1 + \varepsilon)]y$, where $x \in \text{int } C$ and $y \in \text{cl } C$. Therefore, by Proposition 1 it follows that $z \in \text{int } C$. ■

Remark 1. The property stated in Proposition 6 is used when reducing the weak version of the separating hyperplane theorem to the strict version, in a step that shows that if C is a convex set and $b \notin \text{int } C$, then $b \notin \text{int}(\text{cl } C)$, so that there exists a sequence $\{b^k\}$ such that $b^k \notin \text{cl } C$ and $b^k \rightarrow b$, a statement which sounds intuitive, but is not obvious at all. In fact, Propositions 5 and 6 do not hold if one drops the convexity of C . For example, let $N = 1$ and $C = \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$. Then $\text{cl } C = [0, 1]$ and therefore $\text{int}(\text{cl } C) = (0, 1)$ and $\text{bd}(\text{cl } C) = \{0, 1\}$, whereas $\text{int } C = \emptyset$ and $\text{bd } C = [0, 1]$.

References

ROCKAFELLAR, R. T. (1970). *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.