



HAL
open science

Duality for convex infinite optimization on linear spaces

M A Goberna, M Volle

► **To cite this version:**

| M A Goberna, M Volle. Duality for convex infinite optimization on linear spaces. 2022. hal-03540267

HAL Id: hal-03540267

<https://univ-avignon.hal.science/hal-03540267>

Preprint submitted on 23 Jan 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Duality for convex infinite optimization on linear spaces

M. A. Goberna* and M. Volle†

December 7, 2021

Abstract

This note establishes a limiting formula for the conic Lagrangian dual of a convex infinite optimization problem, correcting the classical version of Karney [Math. Programming 27 (1983) 75-82] for convex semi-infinite programs. A reformulation of the convex infinite optimization problem with a single constraint leads to a limiting formula for the corresponding Lagrangian dual, called sup-dual, and also for the primal problem in the case when strong Slater condition holds, which also entails strong sup-duality.

Key words Convex infinite programming · Lagrangian duality · Haar duality · Limiting formulas

Mathematics Subject Classification Primary 90C25; Secondary 49N15 · 46N10

1 Introduction

Given a real linear space X , consider the (algebraic) convex infinite programming (CIP) problem

$$(P) \inf_{x \in X} f(x), \text{ s.t. } f_t(x) \leq 0, t \in T,$$

where T is an infinite index set and $f, f_t : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$, $t \in T$, are convex proper functions. We denote by

$$E := \bigcap_{t \in T} [f_t \leq 0] = \{x \in X : f_t(x) \leq 0, t \in T\}$$

the feasible set of (P) and define

$$M := \bigcap_{t \in T} \text{dom } f_t \supset E \text{ and } \Delta := M \cap \text{dom } f.$$

*Department of Mathematics, University of Alicante, Alicante, Spain (mgoberna@ua.es). Corresponding author.

†Avignon University, LMA EA 2151, Avignon, France (michel.volle@univ-avignon.fr)

Let $\mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}$ be the positive cone of the space $\mathbb{R}^{(T)}$ of functions $\lambda = (\lambda)_{t \in T} : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose support $\text{supp } \lambda := \{t \in T : \lambda_t \neq 0\}$ is finite and let $0_{\mathbb{R}^{(T)}}$ be its null element. The ordinary *Lagrangian function* associated to (P) is (see [7], [8], etc.) is $L_0 : X \times \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $L_0(x, \lambda) := f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x)$, where

$$\sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x) := \begin{cases} \sum_{t \in \text{supp } \lambda} \lambda_t f_t(x), & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0_{\mathbb{R}^{(T)}}, \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda = 0_{\mathbb{R}^{(T)}}. \end{cases}$$

A slightly different Lagrangian is the one associated with the cone constrained reformulation of (P) , that is [14, page 138], the function $L : X \times \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that

$$L(x, \lambda) := \begin{cases} f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x), & \text{if } x \in M, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}, \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We call L the *conic Lagrangian* of (P) .

For each $x \in X$ we have

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} L_0(x, \lambda) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} L(x, \lambda) = f(x) + \delta_E(x),$$

where δ_E is the indicator of E , that is, $\delta_E(x) = 0$ if $x \in E$ and $\delta_E(x) = +\infty$ otherwise. Consequently,

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} L_0(x, \lambda) = \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} L(x, \lambda) = \inf(P).$$

The *ordinary* and *conic-Lagrangian dual problems* of (P) read, respectively,

$$(D_0) \quad \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} \inf_{x \in X} \left(f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x) \right),$$

and

$$(D) \quad \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} \inf_{x \in M} \left(f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x) \right),$$

and one has

$$\sup(D_0) \leq \sup(D) \leq \inf(P). \tag{1.1}$$

Note that, if $\text{dom } f \subset M$, then $\sup(D_0) = \sup(D)$. This is, in particular, the case when the functions f_t , $t \in T$, are real-valued. But it may happen that $\sup(D_0) < \sup(D)$ even if T is finite and Slater condition holds. This is the case in the next example.

Example 1.1 Consider $X = \mathbb{R}^2$, $T = \{1\}$, $f(x_1, x_2) = e^{x_2}$, and

$$f_1(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} x_1, & \text{if } x_2 \geq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } x_2 < 0. \end{cases}$$

We then have

$$\max(D_0) = 0 < 1 = \max(D) = \min(P).$$

Duffin [5] observed that a positive duality gap might occur when one considers the ordinary Lagrangian dual (D_0) of (P). The same happens when (D_0) is replaced by (D) even though, according to (1.1), the gap may be smaller. Different ways have been proposed to close the duality gap, e.g., by adding a linear perturbation to the saddle function $f + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t$, and sending it to zero in the limit [5]. Blair, Duffin and Jeroslow [1] used the conjugate duality theory to extend the limiting phenomena to the general minimax setting. Pomerol [12] showed that it was possible to obtain infisup theorems, including that of [1], by using a slightly more general form of the duality theory. In turn, Karney and Morley [9] proved that, when $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, either the convex semi-infinite programming (CSIP in brief) problem (P) satisfies some recession condition guaranteeing a zero duality gap or there exists $d \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0_n\}$ such that the problem

$$(P_\varepsilon) \quad \inf_{x \in X} f(x) + \varepsilon \langle d, x \rangle, \quad \text{s.t. } f_t(x) \leq 0, \quad t \in T,$$

satisfies the mentioned recession condition for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, with (P_ε) enjoying strong duality, and $\inf(P) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} (P_\varepsilon)$. The theory developed in [9] subsumed the CSIP versions of some results on limiting Lagrangians in [2] and [6]. Three years before, Karney gave, in the CSIP setting, a limiting formula for the dual problem (D_0):

$$\sup(D_0) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, \quad t \in T\}. \quad (1.2)$$

According to [8, Proposition 3.1], this formula comes from [13, Theorem 7] and [2, Corollary 2], and does not require any constraint qualification (other than $E \neq \emptyset$, or something stronger as $E \cap \text{dom } f \neq \emptyset$, $E \subset \text{cl dom } f$, ...). The next example shows that [8, Proposition 3.1] fails even in linear semi-infinite programming, where $\text{dom } f = X = \mathbb{R}^n$, while [13, Theorem 7] and [2, Corollary 2] hold.

Example 1.2 Consider the following optimization problem, with $T = \mathbb{N}$:

$$(P) \quad \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} \quad x_2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{array}{ll} x_1 \leq 0, & (t = 1) \\ -x_2 \leq 1, & (t = 2) \\ t^{-1}x_1 - x_2 \leq 0, & t = 3, 4, \dots \end{array}$$

Its dual problem (D_0), that is also (D), is equivalent to the Haar dual (see, e.g., [7])

$$\begin{array}{ll} \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(\mathbb{N})}} & -\lambda_2 \\ \text{s.t.} & \lambda_1 \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda_2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{t \geq 3} \lambda_t \begin{pmatrix} -t^{-1} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{array}$$

whose unique feasible solution is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(\mathbb{N})}$ such that $\lambda_2 = 1$ and $\lambda_t = 0$ for $t \neq 2$. So, $\max(D_0) = -1$ while $E = \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 \leq 0, x_2 \geq 0\}$, so that $\min(P) = 0$. On the other hand, given $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}\} = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 \leq \varepsilon, x_2 \geq -\varepsilon, \frac{x_1}{3} - x_2 \leq \varepsilon\right\},$$

so that

$$\min \{x_2 : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in \mathbb{N}\} = -\varepsilon$$

is attained at $\{(x_1, -\varepsilon) : x_1 \leq 0\}$. Hence,

$$\max(D_0) = -1 < 0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \min \{x_2 : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

From [8, Proposition 3.1] Karney obtained, following the suggestion of an unknown referee, the reverse strong duality theorem [8, Theorem 3.2] guaranteeing zero duality gap with primal attainment, i.e.,

$$\min(P) = \sup(D_0),$$

under some recession condition. However, he asserted in [8, Section 5] that he had two (longer) unpublished proofs. In either case, his result has been recently proved from a new strong duality theorem for CIP (see [4, Corollary 3.2 and Remark 3.2]).

In this note we show in a simpler way, for general CIP problems, that, under the strong Slater condition

$$\exists \alpha > 0, \exists a \in \text{dom } f : f_t(a) \leq -\alpha, \forall t \in T,$$

(1.2) entails that zero duality gap holds:

$$\sup(D_0) = \inf(P).$$

This duality theorem is obtained by studying the Lagrangian dual (D_1) associated with the representation of E by a single constraint (the so-called sup-function). Section 2 (resp. Section 3) provides a limiting formula for $\sup(D)$ (resp. $\sup(D_1)$). Under the strong Slater condition, the limiting formula for $\sup(D_1)$ also holds for $\inf(P)$ together with the strong duality theorem $\inf(P) = \max(D_1)$.

2 Conic-Lagrangian duality

Problem (D) receives a perturbational interpretation (see [3], [14], etc.) in terms of the *ordinary value function* $v : \mathbb{R}^T \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ associated with (P) defined by

$$v(y) := \inf \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq y_t, t \in T\}, \forall y = (y_t)_{t \in T} \in \mathbb{R}^T.$$

Let us make this approach explicit. The linear space $Y := \mathbb{R}^T$, equipped with the product topology, is a locally convex Hausdorff topological vector space whose topological dual is $\mathbb{R}^{(T)}$ via the bilinear pairing

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : Y \times \mathbb{R}^{(T)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \langle y, \lambda \rangle = \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t y_t.$$

The Fenchel conjugate of v is (see [3], [14], etc.)

$$-v^*(-\lambda) = \begin{cases} \inf_{x \in \Delta} (f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x)), & \text{if } \Delta \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}, \\ -\infty, & \text{if } \Delta = \emptyset \text{ or } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{(T)} \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

If $\Delta \neq \emptyset$ we the have

$$\begin{aligned} v^{**}(0_Y) &= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{(T)}} -v^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{(T)}} -v^*(-\lambda) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} -v^*(-\lambda) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}} \inf_{x \in \Delta} (f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x)) = \sup(D). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, if $\Delta = \emptyset$ we have $\text{dom } v = \emptyset$ and $v^{**}(0_Y) = +\infty = \sup(D)$. Therefore, in all cases we have

$$\sup(D) = v^{**}(0_Y) \leq \bar{v}(0_Y) \leq v(0_Y) = \inf(P), \quad (2.2)$$

where \bar{v} is the lower semicontinuous (lsc in brief) hull of v for the product topology on $Y = \mathbb{R}^T$. A neighborhood basis of the origin 0_Y is furnished by the family

$$\{V_\varepsilon^H : \varepsilon > 0, H \in \mathcal{F}(T)\},$$

where $\mathcal{F}(T)$ is the class of non-empty finite subsets of T , and

$$V_\varepsilon^H := \{y \in Y : |y_t| \leq \varepsilon, t \in H\}.$$

We now give a general explicit formula for $\bar{v}(0_Y)$:

Lemma 2.1 $\bar{v}(0_Y) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0, H \in \mathcal{F}(T)} \inf_{x \in M} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in H\}.$

Proof For each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $H \in \mathcal{F}(T)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{y \in V_\varepsilon^H} v(y) &= \inf \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq y_t, t \in T; |y_t| \leq \varepsilon, t \in H\} \\ &= \inf \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in H; f_t(x) < +\infty, t \notin H\} \\ &= \inf_{x \in M} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in H\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{v}(0_Y) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0, H \in \mathcal{F}(T)} \inf_{y \in V_\varepsilon^H} v(y)$, we are done. □

Remark 2.1 From Lemma 2.1 one gets

$$\bar{v}(0_Y) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}.$$

Remark 2.2 *In the case when the index set T is finite, the formula provided by Lemma 2.1 can be simplified as follows:*

$$\bar{v}(0_Y) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}.$$

In such a case we also have $M = \bigcap_{t \in T} \text{dom } f_t$ and

$$v^{**}(0_Y) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^T} \inf_{x \in M} \left(f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x) \right).$$

Proposition 2.1 (Limiting formula for $\text{sup}(D)$) *Assume either $\bar{v}(0_Y) \neq +\infty$ or $\text{sup}(D) \neq -\infty$. Then we have*

$$\text{sup}(D) = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0, H \in \mathcal{F}(T)} \inf_{x \in M} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in H\}.$$

Proof We know that $\text{sup}(D) = v^{**}(0_Y)$ (see (2.2)). Since the functions f and f_t , $t \in T$, are convex, the value function v is convex, too. By [2, Proposition 1], we then have $\text{sup}(D) = \bar{v}(0_Y)$ and Lemma 2.1 concludes the proof. \square

Remark 2.3 *Condition $\bar{v}(0_Y) \neq +\infty$ is in particular satisfied if $\text{inf}(P) \neq +\infty$, that is $E \cap \text{dom } f \neq \emptyset$.*

Condition $\text{sup}(D) \neq -\infty$ is satisfied if and only if there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$x \in M \implies f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x) \geq r.$$

Remark 2.4 *By (1.1), (2.1) and (2.2), we have*

$$\text{sup}(D_0) \leq \text{sup}(D) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}.$$

In [8, Proposition 3.1] it is claimed that for $X = \mathbb{R}^n$, f and f_t , $t \in T$, are proper, lsc and convex, and $E \neq \emptyset$, it holds that

$$\text{sup}(D_0) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}.$$

To the best of our knowledge, this fact has not been proved anywhere. We prove in Proposition 3.2 below an exact formula for its right-hand side.

3 Sup-Lagrangian duality

Let $h := \sup_{t \in T} f_t$ be the *sup-function* of (P) which allows to represent its feasible set E with a single constraint. We associate with (P) another Lagrangian $L_1 : X \times \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, called *sup-Lagrangian*, such that

$$L_1(x, s) := \begin{cases} f(x) + sh(x), & \text{if } x \in \Delta_1 := \text{dom } f \cap \text{dom } h \text{ and } s \geq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $\Delta_1 \subset \Delta$. For each $x \in X$ we have

$$\sup_{s \geq 0} L_1(x, s) = f(x) + \delta_E(x),$$

and

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{s \geq 0} L_1(x, s) = \inf(P).$$

The corresponding Lagrangian dual problem, say *sup-dual problem*, reads

$$(D_1) \sup_{s \geq 0} \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} (f(x) + sh(x)).$$

Let us introduce the *sup-value function* $v_1 : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ associated with (P) via L_1 , namely,

$$v_1(r) := \inf \{f(x) : h(x) \leq r\}, \quad r \in \mathbb{R},$$

which is non-increasing and satisfies

$$\bar{v}_1(0) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} v_1(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \inf \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Lemma 3.1 $\sup(D) \leq \sup(D_1) \leq \inf(P)$.

Proof Let us prove the first inequality (the second being obvious). Given $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(T)}$, one has to check that

$$\inf_{x \in \Delta} \left(f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x) \right) \leq \sup(D_1).$$

If $\text{supp } \lambda = \emptyset$, then

$$\inf_{x \in \Delta} \left(f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x) \right) = \inf_{x \in \Delta} f \leq \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} f \leq \sup(D_1)$$

and we are done.

If $\text{supp } \lambda \neq \emptyset$, one has, for $s = \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup(D_1) &\geq \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} (f(x) + sh(x)) \\ &\geq \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} (f(x) + s \sum_{t \in T} \frac{\lambda_t}{s} f_t(x)) \\ &\geq \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} (f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x)) \\ &\geq \inf_{x \in \Delta} (f(x) + \sum_{t \in T} \lambda_t f_t(x)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 3.1 (Limiting formula for $\sup(D_1)$) *Assume that either $\bar{v}_1(0) \neq +\infty$ or $\sup(D_1) \neq -\infty$. Then we have*

$$\sup(D_1) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}.$$

Proof By (3.1), the right-hand side of (3.1) coincides with $\bar{v}_1(0)$. By definition of v_1 we have (as for v), $v_1^{**}(0) = \sup(D_1)$. Since v_1 is convex and either $\bar{v}_1(0) \neq +\infty$ or $v_1^{**}(0) \neq -\infty$, we then have, by [2, Proposition 1], $\sup(D_1) = \bar{v}_1(0)$ and we are done. □

Proposition 3.2 (Limiting formula for $\inf(P)$) *Assume that the strong Slater condition*

$$\exists \alpha > 0, \exists a \in \text{dom } f : f_t(a) \leq -\alpha, \forall t \in T, \quad (3.2)$$

holds. Then we have

$$\inf(P) = \max_{s \geq 0} \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} (f(x) + sh(x)) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof By definition of h we have

$$\inf(P) = \inf \{f(x) : h(x) \leq 0\}.$$

Note that (3.2) amounts to the usual Slater condition relative to h :

$$\exists a \in \text{dom } f : h(a) < 0.$$

Since the functions f and h are convex, we then have (see, e.g., [10, Lemma 1])

$$\inf(P) = \max_{s \geq 0} \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} (f(x) + sh(x)) = \max(D_1).$$

By (3.2) we have $\bar{v}_1(0) \leq v_1(0) < +\infty$. By Proposition 3.1 it follows that

$$\sup(D_1) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_t(x) \leq \varepsilon, t \in T\}$$

and we are done. □

Let us revisit Example 1.2, where (3.3) fails. Any candidate a to be strong Slater point is feasible. Let a be a feasible solution of (P) . Then $a = (a_1, 0)$, with $a_1 \leq 0$, and $h(a) \geq \sup \{t^{-1}a_1 : t = 3, 4, \dots\} = 0$. Thus, $h(a) = 0$ and the strong Slater constraint qualification (3.2) fails. However, by Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\sup(D_1) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : h(x) \leq \varepsilon\} = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} -\varepsilon = 0$$

and, finally,

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &= \sup(D_0) = \sup(D) < \sup(D_1) = 0 = \min(P) \\ &= \inf \{f(x) : h(x) = 0\} = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : h(x) \leq \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1 *In the case when T is finite, condition (3.2) reads*

$$\exists a \in \text{dom } f : f_t(a) < 0, \forall t \in T,$$

that is the familiar Slater constraint qualification. One also has $\Delta_1 = \left(\bigcap_{t \in T} \text{dom } f_t \right) \cap \text{dom } f$ and, by Proposition 3.2, there exists $\bar{s} \geq 0$ such that

$$\inf(P) = \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} (f(x) + \bar{s}h(x)) = \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} \sup_{\nu \in S_T} \left(f(x) + \bar{s} \sum_{t \in T} \nu_t f_t(x) \right),$$

where $S_T = \{\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+^T : \sum_{t \in T} \nu_t = 1\}$ is the unit simplex in \mathbb{R}^T . By the minimax theorem [14, Theorem 2.10.1], with $A = S_T$ and $B = \Delta_1$, there exists $\bar{\nu} \in S_T$ such that

$$\inf(P) = \inf_{x \in \Delta_1} \left(f(x) + \bar{s} \sum_{t \in T} \bar{\nu}_t f_t(x) \right) \leq \sup(D) \leq \inf(P)$$

and, consequently, $\inf(P) = \max(D)$, which is the strong duality theorem [14, Theorem 2.9.3] without assuming a topological structure on the basic linear space X (see also [11, Remark 8]).

Concerning Example 1.1, let us note that

$$\max(D_0) = 0 < 1 = \max(D) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{f(x) : f_1(x) \leq \varepsilon\} = \min(P),$$

which also contradicts [8, Proposition 3.1].

Acknowledgement This research was partially supported by Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades (MCIU), Agencia Estatal de Investigación (AEI), and European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), Project PGC2018-097960-B-C22.

References

- [1] Blair, C.E., Duffin, R.J., Jeroslow, R.G.: A limiting infisup theorem. *J Optim Theory Appl* **37**, 163-175 (1982)
- [2] Borwein, J.M.: A note on perfect duality and limiting Lagrangeans. *Math. Programming* **18**, 330-337 (1980)
- [3] Boţ, R.I.: *Conjugate Duality in Convex Optimization*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg (2010)
- [4] Dinh, N., Goberna, M.A., López, M.A., Volle, M.: Relaxed Lagrangian duality in convex infinite optimization: reverse strong duality and optimality. Preprint. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09299>
- [5] Duffin, R.J.: Convex analysis treated by linear programming. *Math. Programming* **4**, 125-143 (1973)
- [6] Duffin, R.J., Jeroslow, R.G.: *The Limiting Lagrangian*. Georgia Institute of Technology, Management Science Technical Reports No. MS-79-13 (1979)
- [7] Goberna, M.A., López, M.A.: *Linear Semi-Infinite Optimization*. J. Wiley, Chichester, U.K., (1998)
- [8] Karney, D.F.: A duality theorem for semi-infinite convex programs and their finite subprograms. *Math. Programming* **27**, 75-82 (1983)
- [9] Karney, D.F., Morley, T.D.: Limiting Lagrangians: A primal approach. *J Optim. Theory Appl.* **48**, 163-174 (1986).
- [10] Lemaire, B., Volle, M.: Duality in DC programming. Generalized convexity, generalized monotonicity: recent results (Luminy, 1996), 331-345, *Nonconvex Optim. Appl.* **27**, Kluwer, Dordrecht (1998)
- [11] Luc, D.T., Volle, M.: Algebraic approach to duality in optimization and applications. *Set-Valued Var. Anal.* **29**, 661-681 (2021)
- [12] Pomerol, J.-Ch.: A note on limiting infisup theorems. *Math. Programming* **30**, 238-241 (1984)
- [13] Rockafellar, R.T.: *Conjugate Duality and Optimization*. SIAM, Philadelphia, P.A. (1974)
- [14] Zălinescu, C.: *Convex analysis in general vector spaces*. World Scientific, River Edge, N.J. (2002)