

Generalized monotonicity and convexity for locally Lipschitz functions on Hadamard manifolds

A. Barani

1 **Abstract.** In this paper we establish connections between some concepts
2 of generalized monotonicity for set valued mappings and some notions of
3 generalized convexity for locally Lipschitz functions on Hadamard mani-
4 folds.

5 **M.S.C. 2010:** 58E17, 90C26.

6 **Key words:** Generalized convexity; generalized monotonicity; mean value theorem;
7 generalized gradient; set valued mapping; Hadamard manifolds.

8 1 Introduction

9 The convexity of a real valued function is equivalent to the monotonicity of the cor-
10 responding gradient function, see [8]. The relation between generalized convexity of
11 functions and generalized monotone operators has been investigated by many authors,
12 for example see [7, 13]. However, in various aspects of mathematics such as control
13 theory and matrix analysis, nonsmooth functions arise naturally on smooth mani-
14 folds, see [10, 15]. Generalized gradients or subdifferentials refer to several set valued
15 replacements for the usual derivatives which are used in developing differential calcul-
16 lus for nonsmooth functions. The concept of generalized gradient of locally Lipschitz
17 function was introduced by F.H. Clarke, see [4].

18 On the other hand, a manifold is not a linear space. Rapcsák [14] and Udriste [17]
19 proposed a generalization of convexity which differs from the others. In this setting
20 the linear space is replaced by a Riemannian manifold and the line segment by a
21 geodesic. In recent years several important notions have been extended from Hilbert
22 spaces to Riemannian manifolds (see for example [1, 2, 3, 10, 18]). In particular the
23 notion of monotone vector fields was introduced by Németh [12]. This notion has been
24 extended by Da Cruz Neto et al. and Li et al. to the case of set valued mappings (see
25 [5, 11]). The organization of the paper is as follows:

26 In Section 2 some concepts and facts from Riemannian geometry are collected. In
27 Section 3 we give a mean value theorem for locally Lipschitz functions defined on
28 Hadamard manifolds. Finally in Section 4 we introduce some notions of convexity
29 and monotonicity of set valued mapping on Hadamard manifolds.

2 Preliminary

In this section some facts in Riemannian geometry are collected (see [9, 17]). Let M be a n dimensional Riemannian manifold with a Riemannian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$ on the tangent space $T_p M \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ for every $p \in M$. The corresponding norm is denoted by $\| \cdot \|_p$. Let us recall that the length of a piecewise C^1 curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is defined by

$$L(\gamma) := \int_a^b \|\gamma'(t)\|_{\gamma(t)} dt.$$

By minimizing this length functional over the set of all such curves with $\gamma(0) = p$ and $\gamma(1) = q$, we obtain a Riemannian distance $d(p, q)$. The space of vector fields on M is denoted by $\mathfrak{X}(M)$. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection associated to M . A geodesic is a C^∞ smooth path γ whose tangent is parallel along the path γ , that is, γ satisfies the equation $\nabla_{d\gamma(t)/dt} d\gamma(t)/dt = 0$. Any path γ joining p and q in M such that $L(\gamma) = d(p, q)$ is a geodesic, and it is called a minimal geodesic.

Levi-Civita connection ∇ induces an isometry $P_{t_1, \gamma}^{t_2} : T_{\gamma(t_1)} M \rightarrow T_{\gamma(t_2)} M$ so called parallel translation along γ from $\gamma(t_1)$ to $\gamma(t_2)$. The exponential mapping $\exp : \tilde{T}M \rightarrow M$ is defined as $\exp(v) := \gamma_v(1)$, where γ_v is the geodesic defined by its position p and velocity $\gamma'_v(0) = v$ at p and $\tilde{T}M$ is an open neighborhood in TM . The restriction of \exp to $T_p M$ in $\tilde{T}M$ is denoted by \exp_p for every $p \in M$. A function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be locally Lipschitz if for every $z \in M$ there is a $L_z \geq 0$ such that for every x, y in a neighborhood of z we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq L_z d(x, y).$$

Recall that for every $x \in M$ there exists a $r > 0$ such that $\exp_x : B(0_x, r) \rightarrow B(x, r)$ and $\exp_x^{-1} : B(x, r) \rightarrow B(0_x, r)$ are Lipschitz.

We recall that a simply connected complete Riemannian manifold of nonpositive sectional curvature is called a Hadamard manifold. If M is a Hadamard manifold then $\exp_p : T_p M \rightarrow M$ is a diffeomorphism for every $p \in M$ and if $x, y \in M$ then there exists a unique minimal geodesic joining x to y . A geodesic triangle $\Delta(p_1 p_2 p_3)$ in a Hadamard manifold M is the set consisting of three distinct points $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in M$ called the vertices and three geodesic segments γ_i joining p_{i+1} to p_{i+2} called the sides where $i \equiv 1, 2, 3 \pmod{3}$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\Delta(p_1 p_2 p_3)$ be a geodesic triangle in the Hadamard manifold M . Denote by $\gamma_{i+1} : [0, l_{i+1}] \rightarrow M$ the geodesic segment joining p_{i+1} to p_{i+2} , $l_{i+1} := L(\gamma_{i+1})$ and set $\theta_{i+1} = \angle(\gamma'_{i+1}(0), -\gamma'_i(l_i))$ where $i \equiv 1, 2, 3 \pmod{3}$. Then,*

$$(2.1) \quad l_{i+1}^2 + l_{i+2}^2 - 2l_{i+1}l_{i+2} \cos(\theta_{i+2}) \leq l_i^2.$$

3 Generalized gradient

Now, we recall the concept of generalized gradient and some important properties of this notion from [3, 16].

52 **Definition 3.1.** Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. The generalized
53 directional derivative $f^\circ(y; v)$ of f at $y \in M$ in the direction $v \in T_y M$ is defined by

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f^\circ(y; v) &:= (f \circ \varphi^{-1})^\circ(\varphi(y); v_\varphi) \\ &= \limsup_{x \rightarrow \varphi(y), \lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{(f \circ \varphi^{-1})(x + \lambda v_\varphi) - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(x)}{\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

54 where $v_\varphi := d\varphi_y(v)$, (U, φ) is a chart at y and $x \in \varphi(U)$.

55 Note that the definition of $f^\circ(y; v)$ is independent of the chart (U, φ) at y . When
56 M is a Hadamard manifold an equivalent definition has appeared in [3, p. 11] as
57 follows,

$$(3.2) \quad f^\circ(y; v) := \limsup_{x \rightarrow y, t \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\exp_x t(d \exp_y)_{\exp_y^{-1} x} v) - f(x)}{t},$$

58 where $(d \exp_y)_{\exp_y^{-1} x} : T_{\exp_y^{-1} x}(T_y M) \simeq T_y M \rightarrow T_x M$ is the differential of exponen-
59 tial mapping at $\exp_y^{-1} x$.

60 In this paper a set valued mapping X on M is a mapping $X : M \rightarrow TM$ such
61 that for every $p \in M$, $X(p) \subseteq T_p M$. For every $p \in M$ and $v \in T_p M$ we set

$$\langle X(p), v \rangle_p := \{\langle \zeta, v \rangle_p : \zeta \in X(p)\}.$$

62 Throughout the remainder of this paper M is a finite dimensional Hadamard manifold.

63 **Definition 3.2.** Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. The generalized
64 gradient (or Clarke subdifferential) of f at $y \in M$ is the subset $\partial_c f(y)$ of $T_y M^* \cong T_y M$
65 defined by

$$\partial_c f(y) := \{\zeta \in T_y M : f^\circ(y; v) \geq \langle \zeta, v \rangle \text{ for all } v \in T_y M\}.$$

66 Not that for a locally Lipschitz function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the generalized gradient
67 $\partial_c f(y)$ is a nonempty closed convex subset of $T_y M$ for every $y \in M$.

68 **Example 3.3.** Let \mathbb{S}^n be the linear space of real $n \times n$ symmetric matrices and \mathbb{S}_{++}^n
69 be the symmetric positive definite real $n \times n$ matrices. Suppose that $M := (\mathbb{S}_{++}^n, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$
70 is the Riemannian manifold endowed by the Euclidean Hessian of $\phi(X) := -\ln \det X$
71 and

$$\langle A, B \rangle = \text{tr}(B\phi''(X)A),$$

72 for all $X \in M$ and $A, B \in T_X M$. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ be an open convex set and $I =$
73 $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Let $F_i : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous differentiable function on Ω . For every
74 $i \in I$ we define the function $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows,

$$F(X) := \max_{i \in I} F_i(X).$$

75 Now, F is locally Lipschitz on Ω and we have

$$\partial_c F(X) = \text{conv}\{\text{grad } F_i(X) : i \in I(X)\},$$

76 where $I(X) = \{i : F(X) = F_i(X)\}$, see [3, p. 34], Lemma 7.3.

77 Now, we recall the following important properties.

78 If $f, g : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are locally Lipschitz functions and $y \in M$ then,

79 (i)

$$\partial_c(f + g)(y) \subseteq \partial_c f(y) + \partial_c g(y).$$

80 (ii) For all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that,

$$\partial(tf)_c(y) = t\partial_c f(y).$$

81 (iii) If f attains a local extremum at y then, $0 \in \partial_c f(y)$.

82 **Remark 3.4.** For a convex function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the subdifferential of f at $y \in M$ is
83 defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial f(y) &:= \{\zeta \in T_y M : \langle \zeta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y \leq f(x) - f(y), \forall x \in M\} \\ &= \{\zeta \in T_y M : \langle \zeta, v \rangle_y \leq f'(y, v), \forall v \in T_y M\}, \end{aligned}$$

84 where

$$f'(y; v) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(\exp_y tv) - f(y)}{t},$$

85 is the directional derivative of f at y in the direction $v \in T_y M$.

86 When f is a locally Lipschitz convex function we have $f'(y; v) = f^\circ(y; v)$ and
87 $\partial_c f(y) = \partial f(y)$ (see [3, p. 12]).

88 At first we extend the Lebourg's mean value theorem (see [4, p. 75]), to Hadamard
89 manifolds which will be useful in the sequel.

90 **Theorem 3.1.** (Mean Value Theorem) *Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function.*
91 *Then, for every $x, y \in M$ there exist points $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $z_0 = \alpha(t_0)$ such that*

$$f(y) - f(x) \in \langle \partial_c f(z_0), \alpha'(t_0) \rangle_{z_0},$$

92 where $\alpha(t) := \exp_y(t \exp_y^{-1} x)$, $t \in [0, 1]$.

93 *Proof.* Let $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined by

$$g(t) := f(\alpha(t)).$$

94 At first we prove that for every $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$(3.3) \quad \partial_c g(t) \subseteq \langle \partial_c f(\alpha(t)), \alpha'(t) \rangle_{\alpha(t)}.$$

95 Fix $t \in [0, 1]$ and suppose that $z := \alpha(t)$. Since $\partial_c g(t)$ and $\langle \partial_c f(\alpha(t)), \alpha'(t) \rangle_{\alpha(t)}$ are
96 intervals in \mathbb{R} , so it suffices to prove that for $d = \pm 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\partial_c g(t)d\} &= g^\circ(t; d) \\ &\leq f^\circ(\alpha(t); \alpha'(t)d) = \max\{\langle \partial_c f(\alpha(t)), \alpha'(t) \rangle_{\alpha(t)} d\}. \end{aligned}$$

97 If we set $\varphi(\cdot) := \exp_z^{-1}(\cdot)$ then,

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} g^\circ(t; d) &= \limsup_{s \rightarrow t, \lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\alpha(s + \lambda d)) - f(\alpha(s))}{\lambda} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \frac{(f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s + \lambda d))) - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s)))}{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

98 On the other hand if $v := \alpha'(t)$ and we consider the curve $\lambda \rightarrow \varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda vd$ in $T_z M$
 99 then,

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{s \rightarrow t, \lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{(f \circ \varphi^{-1})[\varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda vd] - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s)))}{\lambda} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \frac{(f \circ \varphi^{-1})[\varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda vd] - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s)))}{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

100 Now, for brevity we set

$$\beta(s, \lambda) := (f \circ \varphi^{-1})[\varphi(\alpha(s + \lambda d))] - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s))),$$

101

$$\theta(s, \lambda) := (f \circ \varphi^{-1})[\varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda v] - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s))).$$

102 Since $f \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is Lipschitz on an open neighborhood of 0 in $T_z M$ we have

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \frac{\beta(s, \lambda)}{\lambda} - \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \frac{\theta(s, \lambda)}{\lambda} \right| \\ & \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \left| \frac{(f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s + \lambda d))) - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})[\varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda vd]}{\lambda} \right| \\ & \leq K \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \left| \frac{\varphi(\alpha(s + \lambda d)) - \varphi(\alpha(s)) - \lambda vd}{\lambda} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

103 where K is the Lipschitz constant of $f \circ \varphi^{-1}$. Using the Taylor expansion implies that

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi(\alpha(s + \lambda d)) &= \varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda(d\varphi_{\alpha(s)})(\alpha'(s)d) + o(\lambda)|d| \\ &= \varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda(d\varphi_{\alpha(s)})(\alpha'(s)d) + o(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

104 By combining (3.6) and (3.7) we have

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \frac{\beta(s, \lambda)}{\lambda} - \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \frac{\theta(s, \lambda)}{\lambda} \right| \\ & \leq K \left(\sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} \left| \frac{o(\lambda)}{\lambda} \right| + \sup_{|s-t| < \varepsilon, 0 < \lambda < \varepsilon} |(d\varphi_{\alpha(s)})(\alpha'(s)d) - vd| \right). \end{aligned}$$

105 Hence, the right hand side of (3.8) goes to 0 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. By (3.4), (3.5), (3.6) and
 106 (3.8) we have

$$(3.9) \quad g^\circ(t; d) = \limsup_{s \rightarrow t, \lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{(f \circ \varphi^{-1})[\varphi(\alpha(s)) + \lambda vd] - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(\varphi(\alpha(s)))}{\lambda}.$$

107 On the other hand by the definition of directional derivative we get

$$(3.10) \quad f^\circ(\alpha(t); vd) = \limsup_{y' \rightarrow 0, \lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{(f \circ \varphi^{-1})(y' + \lambda vd) - (f \circ \varphi^{-1})(y')}{\lambda}.$$

108 Therefore, by (3.9), (3.10) and definition of lim sup we deduce that

$$(3.11) \quad g^\circ(t; d) \leq f^\circ(\alpha(t); vd),$$

109 this completes the proof of (3.3).

110 Now, we define the function $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows

$$(3.12) \quad h(t) := g(t) + t[f(x) - f(y)].$$

111 Since $h(0) = h(1) = f(x)$ there is a point $t_0 \in (0, 1)$ at which h attains a local
112 extremum. Hence,

$$(3.13) \quad 0 \in \partial_c h(t_0).$$

113 Set $z_0 = \alpha(t_0)$. Thus, by using (3.3), (3.12) and (3.13) we get

$$f(x) - f(y) \in \partial_c g(t_0) \subseteq \langle \partial_c f(z_0), \alpha'(t_0) \rangle_{z_0},$$

114 and proof is completed. \square

115 4 Strong convexity and monotonicity

116 In this section we establish the relations between (strict, strong) convexity of a locally
117 Lipschitz function f and (strict, strong) monotonicity of $\partial_c f$ as a set valued mapping.

118 **Definition 4.1.** Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz real valued function. Then,

119 (i) f is said to be convex if for every $x, y \in M$,

$$f(\gamma(t)) \leq tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1],$$

120 (ii) f is said to be strictly convex if for every $x, y \in M$ with $x \neq y$,

$$f(\gamma(t)) < tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, 1),$$

121 (iii) f is said to be strongly convex if there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that for every
122 $x, y \in M$

$$f(\gamma(t)) \leq tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) - \alpha t(1-t)d(x, y)^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1],$$

123 where $\gamma(t) := \exp_y(t \exp_y^{-1} x)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

124 Note that every strongly convex function is convex but the convex is not holds.

125 **Example 4.2.** Let $S \subseteq M$ be an open convex set, $q \in M$ and $I = \{1, \dots, m\}$. Let
126 $f_i : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable function on S and continuous on \bar{S} , for
127 every $i \in I$. Assume that $-\infty < \inf_{p \in M} f(p)$ and for every $i \in I$, $\text{grad} f_i$ is Lipschitz
128 on S with constant L_i and

$$\{p \in M : f(p) \leq f(q)\} \subseteq S, \quad \inf_{p \in M} f(p) < f(q).$$

129 Suppose that $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$(4.1) \quad f(y) := \max_{i \in I} f_i(y), \quad \text{for all } y \in M.$$

130 Fix $y \in M$. Suppose that λ satisfies $\sup_{i \in I} L_i < \lambda$. Then, the function $g : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
 131 defined by

$$(4.2) \quad g(x) := f(x) + \frac{\lambda}{2} d^2(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x \in M,$$

132 is locally Lipschitz and strongly convex with constant $\alpha := \lambda - \sup_{i \in I} L_i$ (see Lemma
 133 4.1 in [3, p. 16]).

134 Now, we give the following definition for a set valued mapping (see [5, 11]).

135 **Definition 4.3.** Let $X : M \rightarrow TM$ be a set valued mapping. Then, X is said to be
 136 (i) monotone if for every $x, y \in M$ and $\zeta \in X(x), \eta \in X(y)$,

$$(4.3) \quad \langle P_{1,\gamma}^0 \zeta - \eta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y \geq 0,$$

137 (ii) strictly monotone if for every $x, y \in M$ with $x \neq y$ and every $\zeta \in X(x), \eta \in X(y)$,

$$(4.4) \quad \langle P_{1,\gamma}^0 \zeta - \eta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y > 0,$$

138 (iii) strongly monotone if there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that for every $x, y \in M$
 139 and every $\zeta \in X(x), \eta \in X(y)$,

$$(4.5) \quad \langle P_{1,\gamma}^0 \zeta - \eta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y \geq \alpha d(x, y)^2,$$

140 where $\gamma(t) := \exp_y(t \exp_y^{-1} x)$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$.

141 In the next theorem we introduce some characterizations of convex and strongly
 142 convex functions.

143 **Theorem 4.1.** Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. Then,

144 (i) f is convex if and only if for every $x, y \in M$ and every $\zeta \in \partial_c f(y)$ we have

$$(4.6) \quad f(x) - f(y) \geq \langle \zeta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y,$$

145 (ii) f is strongly convex with a constant $\alpha > 0$ if and only if for every $x, y \in M$ and
 146 every $\zeta \in \partial_c f(y)$ we have

$$(4.7) \quad f(x) - f(y) \geq \langle \zeta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y + \alpha d(x, y)^2.$$

147 *Proof.* We only prove (ii). The prove of (i) is similar. Suppose that f is strongly
 148 convex with a constant $\alpha > 0$. Let $x, y \in M$ and $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be the unique
 149 geodesic joining y to x that is, $\gamma(t) = \exp_y(t \exp_y^{-1} x)$. Then, $\gamma'(0) = \exp_y^{-1} x$ and we
 150 have

$$f(\gamma(t)) \leq t f(x) + (1-t) f(y) - \alpha t(1-t) d(x, y)^2 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

151 This implies that

$$(4.8) \quad t(f(\gamma(t)) - f(x)) + (1-t)(f(\gamma(t)) - f(y)) \leq -\alpha t(1-t) d(x, y)^2.$$

152 Divide by $t > 0$ and taking limit in (4.8) implies that

$$(4.9) \quad f(y) - f(x) + f'(y; v) \leq -\alpha d(x, y)^2,$$

153 where $v := \gamma'(0)$. Since f is convex by Remark 3.4, $f^\circ(y; v) = f'(y; v)$ hence, inequal-
154 ity (4.9) implies that

$$f(y) - f(x) + f^\circ(y; v) \leq -\alpha d(x, y)^2.$$

155 Therefore, for every $\zeta \in \partial_c f(y)$ we have

$$f(x) - f(y) \geq \langle \zeta, v \rangle_y + \alpha d(x, y)^2.$$

156 Conversely, assume that inequality (4.7) holds for every $x, y \in M$ and every $\zeta \in$
157 $\partial_c f(y)$. Fix $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\zeta \in \partial_c f(\gamma(t))$. Now, we define the geodesics $\theta, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$
158 as follows

$$\theta(s) := \gamma((1-s)t) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1],$$

159 and

$$\beta(s) := \gamma(s + (1-s)t) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1].$$

160 Then, by (4.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1-t)f(y) - (1-t)f(\gamma(t)) &\geq \\ (1-t)(\langle \zeta, \theta'(0) \rangle_{\gamma(t)} + \alpha d(y, \gamma(t))^2) &= \\ (1-t)(-t\langle \zeta, \gamma'(t) \rangle_{\gamma(t)} + \alpha d(y, \gamma(t))^2). \end{aligned}$$

161 Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} tf(x) - tf(\gamma(t)) &\geq \\ t(\langle \zeta, \beta'(0) \rangle_{\gamma(t)} + \alpha d(x, \gamma(t))^2) &= \\ t((1-t)\langle \zeta, \gamma'(t) \rangle_{\gamma(t)} + \alpha d(x, \gamma(t))^2). \end{aligned}$$

162 By adding these two inequalities we get

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) - f(\gamma(t)) &\geq \\ \alpha[(1-t)d(y, \gamma(t))^2 + td(x, \gamma(t))^2]. \end{aligned}$$

163 Note that

$$(4.11) \quad d(y, \gamma(t))^2 = t^2 \|\exp_y^{-1} x\|_y^2 = t^2 d(y, x)^2.$$

164 On the other hand by triangle inequality and (4.11) we have

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} d(x, \gamma(t))^2 &\geq d(y, x)^2 + d(y, \gamma(t))^2 - 2\langle \exp_y^{-1}(\gamma(t)), \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y \\ &= (1-t)^2 d(y, x)^2. \end{aligned}$$

165 By combining (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) we obtain that

$$tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) - f(\gamma(t)) \geq t(1-t)\alpha d(y, x)^2.$$

166 Therefore, f is strongly convex. \square

167 Now, we introduce the relation between convexity of a real valued function f
168 defined on M and monotonicity of $\partial_c f$.

169 **Theorem 4.2.** *Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. Then, f is convex on*
 170 *M if and only if $\partial_c f$ is a monotone set valued mapping on M .*

171 *Proof.* Assume that f is convex then, $\partial_c f = \partial f$, hence $\partial_c f$ is a monotone set valued
 172 mapping (see [5, p. 77]).

173 Conversely, suppose that $\partial_c f$ is a monotone set valued mapping on M . Let $x,$
 174 $y \in M$ with $x \neq y$ and $t \in (0, 1)$. Assume that $\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is the unique geodesic
 175 defined by

$$\beta(s) := \gamma(s + (1-s)t) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1].$$

176 Then, by Theorem 3.1 there exist $l \in (t, 1)$ and $\zeta \in \partial_c f(\beta(l))$ such that

$$(4.13) \quad f(x) - f(\gamma(t)) = \langle \zeta, \beta'(l) \rangle_{\beta(l)} = (1-t) \langle \zeta, \gamma'(a) \rangle_{z_1},$$

177 where, $a := l + (1-l)t > t$ and $z_1 := \alpha(l)$. Similarly if we consider the unique geodesic
 178 $\theta : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ defined by

$$\theta(s) := \gamma((1-s)t) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1].$$

179 Then, by Theorem 3.1 there exist $h \in (0, t)$ and $\eta \in \partial_c f(\theta(h))$ such that

$$(4.14) \quad f(y) - f(\gamma(t)) = \langle \eta, \theta'(h) \rangle_{\theta(h)} = -t \langle \eta, \gamma'(b) \rangle_{z_2},$$

180 where $b := (1-h)t < t$ and $z_2 := \gamma((1-h)t)$. Now, we define the geodesic $\mu : [0, 1] \rightarrow$
 181 M as follows

$$\mu(s) := \gamma(sa + (1-s)b) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1].$$

182 Then, by equation (4.13) and parallel translation along μ we get

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} tf(x) - tf(\gamma(t)) &= t(1-t) \langle \zeta, \gamma'(a) \rangle_{z_1} \\ &= t(1-t) \langle P_{1,\mu}^0 \zeta, P_{1,\mu}^0 \mu'(1) \rangle_{z_2} \\ &= \frac{t(1-t)}{a-b} \langle P_{1,\mu}^0 \zeta, \mu'(0) \rangle_{z_2}. \end{aligned}$$

183 On the other hand the equation (4.14) implies that

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} (1-t)f(y) - (1-t)f(\gamma(t)) &= -t(1-t) \langle \eta, \gamma'(b) \rangle_{z_2} \\ &= -\frac{t(1-t)}{a-b} \langle \eta, \mu'(0) \rangle_{z_2}. \end{aligned}$$

184 By adding (4.15) and (4.16) we obtain

$$(4.17) \quad tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) - f(\gamma(t)) = \frac{t(1-t)}{a-b} \langle P_{1,\mu}^0 \zeta - \eta, \mu'(0) \rangle_{z_2}.$$

185 Since $\partial_c f$ is a monotone set valued mapping on M we have

$$(4.18) \quad \langle P_{1,\mu}^0 \zeta - \eta, \mu'(0) \rangle_{z_2} \geq 0.$$

186 Therefore, combining (4.17) and (4.18) implies that

$$tf(x) + (1-t)f(y) - f(\gamma(t)) \geq 0,$$

187 and proof is completed. □

188 Similarly for a locally Lipschitz function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we can see; f is strictly
189 convex on M if and only if $\partial_c f$ is a strictly monotone set valued mapping on M .

190 **Theorem 4.3.** *Let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. Then, f is strongly*
191 *convex on M with $\alpha > 0$ if and only if $\partial_c f$ is a strongly monotone set valued mapping*
192 *on M with 2α .*

193 *Proof.* Let $\partial_c f$ be strongly monotone set valued mapping on M with $\beta = 2\alpha > 0$.
194 Suppose that $x, y \in M$ and $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is the unique geodesic joining y to x that
195 is, $\gamma(t) = \exp_y(t \exp_y^{-1} x)$. Assume by contrary that f is not strongly convex on M .
196 Then, for every $\sigma > 0$ there exist x_0, y_0 with $x_0 \neq y_0$ and $\zeta_0 \in \partial_c f(y_0)$ such that

$$(4.19) \quad f(x_0) - f(y_0) < \langle \zeta_0, \exp_{y_0}^{-1} x_0 \rangle_{y_0} + \sigma d(x_0, y_0)^2.$$

197 By Theorem 3.1 there exist $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, $u_0 = \gamma(t_0)$ and $\psi_0 \in \partial_c f(u_0)$ such that

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x_0) - f(y_0) &= \langle \psi_0, \gamma'(t_0) \rangle_{u_0} \\ &= \langle P_{0,\eta}^1 \psi_0, P_{0,\eta}^1 \gamma'(t_0) \rangle_{y_0} \\ &= -\frac{1}{t_0} \langle P_{0,\eta}^1 \psi_0, P_{0,\eta}^1 \eta'(0) \rangle_{y_0} \\ &= -\frac{1}{t_0} \langle P_{0,\eta}^1 \psi_0, \eta'(1) \rangle_{y_0} \\ &= \langle P_{0,\eta}^1 \psi_0, \exp_{y_0}^{-1} x_0 \rangle_{y_0}, \end{aligned}$$

198 where $\eta(s) := \gamma((1-s)t_0)$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. By combining (4.19) and (4.20) we have

$$(4.21) \quad \langle P_{0,\alpha}^1 \psi_0 - \zeta_0, \exp_{y_0}^{-1} x_0 \rangle_{y_0} < \sigma d(x_0, y_0)^2.$$

199 Since $\partial_c f$ is strongly monotone set valued mapping on M with β we have

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta d(y_0, u_0)^2 &\leq \langle P_{1,\eta}^0 \zeta_0 - \psi_0, \eta'(0) \rangle_{u_0} \\ &= \langle P_{0,\eta}^1 [P_{1,\eta}^0 \zeta_0 - \psi_0], P_{0,\eta}^1 (\eta'(0)) \rangle_{y_0} \\ &= \langle \zeta_0 - P_{0,\eta}^1 \psi_0, \eta'(1) \rangle_{y_0} \\ &= t_0 \langle P_{0,\eta}^1 \psi_0 - \zeta_0, \gamma'(0) \rangle_{y_0} \\ &= t_0 \langle P_{0,\eta}^1 \psi_0 - \zeta_0, \exp_{y_0}^{-1} x_0 \rangle_{y_0}. \end{aligned}$$

200 By (4.21) and (4.22) we get

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta t_0^2 d(y_0, x_0)^2 &= \beta d(y_0, u_0)^2 \\ &\leq t_0 \langle P_{0,\alpha}^1 \psi_0 - \zeta_0, \exp_{y_0}^{-1} x_0 \rangle_{y_0} \\ &< t_0 \sigma d(x_0, y_0)^2, \end{aligned}$$

201 hence, $\sigma > t_0 \beta$ which contradicts the arbitrariness of σ . Thus, f is strongly convex
202 on M .

203 Suppose that f is strongly convex on M with $\theta > 0$. We show that $\theta = \alpha$. For
204 every $x, y \in M$ and every $\zeta \in \partial_c f(y)$ and $\omega \in \partial_c f(x)$ by using Theorem 4.1 (ii) we
205 get

$$f(x) - f(y) \geq \langle \zeta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y + \theta d(x, y)^2,$$

206 and

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) - f(x) &\geq \langle \omega, \exp_x^{-1} y \rangle_x + \theta d(x, y)^2 \\ &= \langle P_{1,\gamma}^0 \omega, -\exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y + \theta d(x, y)^2. \end{aligned}$$

207 Adding these two inequalities implies that

$$\langle P_{1,\gamma}^0 \omega - \zeta, \exp_y^{-1} x \rangle_y \geq 2\theta d(x, y)^2.$$

208 The converse is immediate consequence of theorem 4.1 (ii). \square

209 Now, we give an example of a strongly monotone set valued mapping.

210 **Example 4.4.** Suppose that all assumptions on Example 4.2 holds. Then, the for all
211 $i \in I$ the functions

$$(4.24) \quad h_i(x) := f_i(x) + \frac{\lambda_i}{2} d^2(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x \in M,$$

212 and

$$(4.25) \quad g(x) := f(x) + \frac{\lambda}{2} d^2(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x \in M,$$

213 are strongly convex with constant $\alpha = \lambda - \sup_{i \in I} L_i$. Now, by Theorem 4.3, the set
214 valued mappings $\partial_c h_i, i \in I$ and $\partial_c g$ are strongly monotone on S with constant 2α .

215 References

- 216 [1] A. Barani and M. R. Pouryayevali, *Vector optimization problem under d -invexity*
217 *on Riemannian manifolds*, Diff. Geom. Dyn. Syst., 13 (2011) 34-44.
- 218 [2] A. Barani, S. Hosseini and M. R. Pouryayevali, *On metric projection onto*
219 *φ -convex subsets of Hadamard manifolds*, accepted to Rev. Math. Complut.
220 (DOI/10.1007/13163-011-0085-4).
- 221 [3] G. C. Bento, O. P. Ferreira and P. R. Oliveira, *Proximal point method for a*
222 *special class of nonconvex functions on Hadamard manifolds*, preprint [http://](http://arXiv.org/0809.2594v6)
223 arXiv.org/0809.2594v6 [math.oc] 13 Apr 2010.
- 224 [4] F. H. Clarke, Yu. S. Ledyayev, R. G. Stern and P. R. Wolenski, *Nonsmooth Anal-*
225 *ysis and Control Theory*, Grad. Texts in Math. 178, Springer, 1998.
- 226 [5] J. X. Da Cruze Neto, O. P. Ferreira, L. R. Lucambio Pérez, *Monotone point-*
227 *to-set vector fields*, Balkan Journal of Geometry and its Applications 5 (2000)
228 69-79.
- 229 [6] O. P. Ferreira, L. R. Lucambio Pérez, S. Z. Németh, *Singularities of monotone*
230 *vector fields and an exteragradeient-type algorithm*, Journal of Global Optimiza-
231 tion 31 (2005) 133-151.
- 232 [7] L. Fan, S. Liu and S. Gao, *Generalized monotonicity and convexity of non-*
233 *differentiable functions*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 279
234 (2003) 276-289.
- 235 [8] S. Karamadrian and S. Schaible, *Seven kinds of monotone maps*, Journal of
236 Optimization Theory and Applications 66 (1990) 37-46.

- 237 [9] S. Lang, *Fundamentals of Differential Geometry*, Springer-verlag, Graduate Text
238 in Mathematics, volume 191, New York, 1999.
- 239 [10] Yu. S. Ledyev, and Q. J. Zhu, *Nonsmooth Analysis on smooth manifolds*, (2006),
240 Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 395 (2007) 3687-3732.
- 241 [11] C. Li, G. López and V. Martín-Márquez, *Monotone vector fields and the proximal
242 point algorithm on Hadamard manifolds*, Journal of London Mathematical
243 Society Advance Access published, Page 1-21 (2009).
- 244 [12] S. Z. Németh, *Monotone vector fields*, Publicationes Mathematicae 54 (1999) 437-
245 449.
- 246 [13] R. Pini, C. Singh, *Generalized convexity and generalized monotonicity*, Journal
247 of Information and Optimization Sciences 20 (1999) 215-233.
- 248 [14] T. Rapsacák, *Smooth Nonlinear Optimization in \mathbb{R}^n* , Kluwer Academic Publishers,
249 Dordrecht, 1997.
- 250 [15] R. Saigal, *Existence of the generalized complementarity problem*, Math. Oper.
251 Res., 1 (1976) 260-766.
- 252 [16] W. Thamel, *Directional Derivatives and generalized gradients on manifolds*, *Op-
253 timization*, 25 (1992) 97-115.
- 254 [17] C. Udriste, *Convex functions and Optimization methods on Riemannian Mani-
255 folds*, Mathematics and its Applications 297, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.
- 256 [18] C. Udriste and A. Pitea, *Optimization problems via second order Lagrangians*,
257 *Balkan Journal of Geometry and its Applications*, 16 (2011) 174-185.

258 *Author's address:*

259 A. Barani
260 Department of Mathematics, Lorestan University,
261 P. O. Box 465, Khoramabad, Iran.
262 E-mail: barani.a@lu.ac.ir , alibarani2000@yahoo.com