

## Robust generalized S-Procedure

N. Dinh · M.A. Goberna · D.H. Long ·  
M. Volle

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

*Dedicated to Professor Hoang Xuan Phu on the occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> birthday.*

**Abstract** We introduce in this paper the so-called robust generalized  $S$ -procedure associated with a given robust optimization problem. We provide a primal characterization for the validity of this procedure as well as a dual characterization under the assumption that the decision space is locally convex. We also analyze an extension of the mentioned robust  $S$ -procedure that incorporates a right-hand side function.

**Keywords**  $S$ -procedure · Robust optimization · perturbational duality · Conjugacy · Hahn-Banach Theorem

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2000)** 90C17 · 90C46 · 49N15 · 46N10

### 1 Introduction

According to [13], the “ $S$ -procedure” is the name given in [1] - a monograph on the stability of nonlinear automatic control systems where certain function denoted by  $S$  (the initial of “stability”) plays a crucial role - to a method which allows to solve systems of quadratic inequalities by solving suitable linear matrix inequality relaxations. Yakubovich was the first one to give sufficient conditions for these

---

Nguyen Dinh, Corresponding author

International University, Vietnam National University- HCMC, Linh Trung ward, Thu Duc district, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam ([ndinh@hcmiu.edu.vn](mailto:ndinh@hcmiu.edu.vn)); Vietnam National University - HCMC, Linh Trung ward, Thu Duc district, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam.

M.A. Goberna

Department of Mathematics, University of Alicante, 03080 Alicante, Spain ([mgoberna@ua.es](mailto:mgoberna@ua.es)).

D.H. Long

Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology, Vietnam National University - HCMC, 268 Ly Thuong Kiet, Ward 14, District 10, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam ([danghailong@hcmut.edu.vn](mailto:danghailong@hcmut.edu.vn)).

M. Volle

Département de Mathématiques, LMA EA 2151, Avignon, France ([michel.volle@univ-avignon.fr](mailto:michel.volle@univ-avignon.fr)).

relaxations to be exact in the sense that it is possible to obtain a solution for these quadratic systems using their corresponding relaxations [21]. The classic theorem of losslessness of the  $S$ -procedure (in short  $S$ -procedure) characterizes when certain concave quadratic inequality is consequence of a given system of convex quadratic inequalities in terms of the concave function being a nonnegative linear combination of the convex constraints and a suitable trivial constraint. This result allows to get optimality conditions for convex quadratic problems. In fact, given a family of convex quadratic functions  $q, q_1, \dots, q_m$ , and

$$\bar{x} \in X := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : q_i(x) \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, m\},$$

observing that  $\bar{x}$  is an optimal solution of  $\inf_{x \in X} q(x)$  if and only if the concave inequality  $q(\bar{x}) - q(x) \leq 0$  is consequence of the system of convex quadratic inequalities  $\{q_i(x) \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, m\}$ . The classic  $S$ -procedure can be seen as a nonlinear version of Farkas' lemma and has a clear algebraic nature in the sense that it is closely related with convex analysis and the Lagrange and Fenchel duality theories for optimization problems.

It is worth observing that certain authors call  $S$ -lemma to the theorem of the  $S$ -procedure when there exists a unique constraint [5], while other authors prefer to call  $S$ -lemma to the characterization of the concave quadratic inequalities which are consequence of systems of convex quadratic inequalities and  $S$ -procedure to its application to nonlinear automatic control systems [16].

The validity of the  $S_F$ -procedure provides optimality conditions for deterministic optimization problems, but it is well-known that the data are uncertain in many optimization problems arising in practice. For instance, in robust optimization the conservative decision-maker assumes the existence of an uncertainty set  $U$  and a family of uncertain functions  $f, f_1, \dots, f_m : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and considers elements of the robust feasible set

$$X := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_i(x, u) \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, m, u \in U\}$$

in order to guarantee the feasibility of the chosen decision under any conceivable scenario. Then, the (pessimistic) robust optimization problem to be solved reads

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{u \in U} f(x, u).$$

Let us show how uncertain quadratic systems arise in astrophysics. Descartes [6] conceived in 1644 the tessellation of the space into regions of *influence* of the fixed stars according to proximities for the Euclidean distance. In his model, if  $T$  is the (huge) set of fixed stars, the region of influence of certain  $s \in T$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \|x - s\| \leq \|x - t\|, t \in T\} &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \|x - s\|^2 \leq \|x - t\|^2, t \in T\} \\ &= \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \langle (t - s), x \rangle \leq \frac{\|t\|^2 - \|s\|^2}{2}, t \in T\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

a polyhedron presently called Voronoi cell of  $s$  (see a 2D representation of Descartes' tessellation in [14, Figure 2]). This model became obsolete after the publication of Newton's Principia in 1687 [15], where he stated the law of universal gravitation that forces to replace the distance  $\|x - t\|$  in the above cell by the gravitational potential created by the star  $t$  at  $x$ , i.e.,  $u_t \|x - t\|^{-2}$ , for  $x \neq t$ , where  $u_t$  is the product of the gravitational constant times the mass of star  $t$ . Assume that

this uncertain scalar ranges on some interval  $U_t$  and define the uncertainty set  $U := \prod_{t \in T} U_t$ . For  $x \notin T$  one has

$$u_s \|x - s\|^{-2} \geq u_t \|x - t\|^{-2} \iff u_t \|x - t\|^2 \leq u_s \|x - s\|^2,$$

so that the (uncertain) influence region of  $s \in T$  writes

$$\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : q_t(x, u) \leq 0, \ t \in T \right\},$$

where  $q_t(x, u) = u_t \|x - t\|^2 - u_s \|x - s\|^2$  is a non-convex (actually D.C.) quadratic function for all  $t \in T$ .

The deterministic classic  $S$ -procedure has been extended in different ways to more general functions, see for instance the survey papers [5], [13] and [16]. This can be done, e.g., in either a geometric way ([4], where the *decision set*  $X$  is the solution set of a given constraint system posed in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) or in the following perturbational way ([3], [17], [18], [20], etc., where the decision set  $X$  is arbitrary): Let  $Y$  be a locally convex Hausdorff topological vector space (lcHtvs in short) of perturbations whose null element is  $0_Y$  and whose topological dual is  $Y^*$ , with duality product  $\langle \lambda, y \rangle := \lambda(y)$  for all  $(\lambda, y) \in Y^* \times Y$ .

Let

$$F: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$$

be a perturbation functional, also called *Rockafellian* in [3] and [18], and let

$$\inf_{x \in X} F(x, 0_Y)$$

be the corresponding optimization problem. The *generalized S-procedure* associated with  $F$  introduced in [20],  $S_F$ -*procedure* in brief, is concerned with the next two statements:

- (A)  $F(x, 0_Y) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in X$ ,
- (B)  $\exists \bar{\lambda} \in Y^* : F(x, y) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, y \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ .

Then, the  $S_F$ -procedure is said to be *valid* if (A)  $\iff$  (B) or, equivalently, (A)  $\implies$  (B).

Roughly speaking, we are concerned with the adaptation of the  $S_F$ -procedure to robust optimization problems. More precisely, in this paper we consider a given uncertainty set  $U$  and a corresponding family of Rockafellians  $F_u: X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $u \in U$ . Our purpose is to introduce and characterize a robust generalized  $S$ -procedure associated with the robust optimization problem

$$\inf_{x \in X} \left\{ \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) \right\},$$

called *robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure*, which is concerned with the statements

- (A)  $\sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in X$ ,
- (B)  $\exists (\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}) \in U \times Y^* : F_{\bar{u}}(x, y) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, y \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ .

Observe that, if  $(\mathfrak{B})$  holds and  $x \in X$ , then

$$\sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) \geq F_{\bar{u}}(x, 0_Y) \geq -\langle \bar{\lambda}, 0_Y \rangle = 0,$$

i.e.,  $(\mathfrak{A})$  holds, too. Then, the robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure is said to be *valid* if  $(\mathfrak{A}) \implies (\mathfrak{B})$  or, equivalently,  $(\mathfrak{A}) \iff (\mathfrak{B})$ .

We also consider the *robust generalized  $S$ -procedure with right-hand side (RHS in brief) function  $h \in \Gamma(X)$*  (the family of proper convex and lower semicontinuous functions from  $X$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ ), *robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}^h$ -procedure for short*, whose corresponding statements are

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{A}_h) \quad & \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) \geq h(x) \text{ for all } x \in X, \\ (\mathfrak{B}_h) \quad & \begin{cases} \forall a' \in \text{dom } h^*, \exists (\bar{u}, \bar{y}) \in U \times Y^* \text{ such that} \\ F_{\bar{u}}(x, y) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, y \rangle \geq \langle a', x \rangle - h^*(a'), \forall (x, y) \in X \times Y, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where  $h^*$  is the Fenchel conjugate of  $h$  and  $\text{dom } h^*$  is its domain. We say that the robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}^h$ -procedure is *valid* if  $(\mathfrak{A}_h) \iff (\mathfrak{B}_h)$  or, equivalently,  $(\mathfrak{A}_h) \implies (\mathfrak{B}_h)$  (the proof of  $(\mathfrak{B}_h) \implies (\mathfrak{A}_h)$  is postponed to Lemma 3).

The rest of the paper is organized in three sections. We present in Section 2 a primal characterization for the validity of the robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure (Theorem 1 and Corollaries 1 and 2). Section 3 analyzes the case when  $X$  is a lcHtvs (as  $Y$ ), obtaining a dual characterization of the robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure (Theorem 2 and Corollary 3). Finally, we characterize in Section 4 the validity of the robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}^h$ -procedure (Theorem 3 and Corollary 4).

We basically follow the notation of [22], which is also the reference for the results on convex analysis in lcHtvs, specially conjugate calculus.

## 2 A primal characterization of the robust $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure

In this section  $X$  is a given set and  $\{F_u\}_{u \in U}$  is a family of Rockafellians

$$F_u: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}, \quad \forall u \in U.$$

Given  $G: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  we denote by

$$\mathcal{G} := \{(y, r) \in Y \times \mathbb{R} : \exists x \in X, G(x, y) \leq r\}$$

the projection of the epigraph of  $G$ ,

$$\text{epi } G := \{(x, y, r) \in X \times Y \times \mathbb{R} : G(x, y) \leq r\},$$

on  $Y \times \mathbb{R}$  and by

$$\text{dom } G := \{(x, y) \in X \times Y : G(x, y) < +\infty\}$$

the domain of  $G$ , that is the projection of  $\text{epi } G$  on  $X \times Y$ .

We set  $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, +\infty[$  and  $\mathbb{R}_+^* := ]0, +\infty[$ .

**Lemma 1** Given  $G: X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , the following statements are equivalent:

- (i)  $G(x, 0_Y) \geq 0, \forall x \in X,$
- (ii)  $(0_Y, -1) \notin \mathbb{R}_+^* \mathcal{G},$
- (iii)  $(0_Y, -1) \notin \mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{G}.$

**Proof** “Non (i)” amounts to say that

$$\begin{aligned} \exists x \in X : G(x, 0_Y) < 0 &\iff \exists (x, \theta) \in X \times \mathbb{R}_+^* : G(x, 0_Y) \leq -\theta \\ &\iff \exists \theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^* : (0_Y, -\theta) \in \mathcal{G} \\ &\iff \exists \theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^* : (0_Y, -1) \in \frac{1}{\theta} \mathcal{G} \\ &\iff (0_Y, -1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^* \mathcal{G}, \end{aligned}$$

that is “Non (ii)” or, equivalently, “Non (iii)”.  $\square$

For a subset  $C$  of a lCHtvs we denote by  $\text{co}C$  its convex hull and by  $\overline{C}$  its closure.

**Lemma 2** (see [20, Proposition 2.1]) Let  $G: X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ . The following statements are equivalent

- (i)  $\exists \lambda \in Y^*$  such that  $G(x, y) + \langle \lambda, y \rangle \geq 0, \forall (x, y) \in X \times Y,$
- (ii)  $(0_Y, -1) \notin \overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{G}).$

**Proof** Note that if  $\text{dom } G = \emptyset$  then (i) and (ii) are both satisfied. So we can assume that  $\text{dom } G \neq \emptyset$ , which entails  $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$ .

[(i)  $\implies$  (ii)] By (i) there exists  $\lambda \in Y^*$  such that

$$r + \langle \lambda, y \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } (y, r) \in \mathcal{G},$$

that means  $\mathcal{G} \subset \text{epi}(-\lambda)$ . Now  $\text{epi}(-\lambda)$  is a closed convex cone containing  $\mathcal{G}$ . By this we have  $\overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{G}) \subset \text{epi}(-\lambda)$ . Since  $(0_Y, -1) \notin \text{epi}(-\lambda)$  it follows that (ii) holds.

[(ii)  $\implies$  (i)] By the Hahn-Banach separation Theorem ([19, Theorem 3.4]), there exists  $(\mu, s) \in Y^* \times \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$-s = \langle \mu, 0_Y \rangle - s > \alpha := \sup_{\substack{\theta \geq 0 \\ G(x, y) \leq r}} \theta (\langle \mu, y \rangle + rs).$$

We have necessarily

$$G(x, y) \leq r \implies \langle \mu, y \rangle + rs \leq 0.$$

Therefore  $\alpha \leq 0$  and, since  $\text{dom } G \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\alpha = 0$ . Thus  $s < 0$  and, setting  $\lambda = \mu/s$ , we get that

$$G(x, y) \leq r \implies \langle \lambda, y \rangle + r \geq 0$$

and (i) holds.  $\square$

**Theorem 1** Let  $F_u: X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, u \in U$ . The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure is valid,
- (ii)  $(0_Y, -1) \notin \left[ \bigcap_{u \in U} \overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}_u) \right] \setminus \left[ \mathbb{R}_+ \bigcap_{u \in U} \mathcal{F}_u \right].$

**Proof** [(i)  $\implies$  (ii)] Assume that  $(0_Y, -1) \notin \mathbb{R}_+ \bigcap_{u \in U} \mathcal{F}_u$ , where

$$\mathcal{F}_u := \{(y, r) \in Y \times \mathbb{R} : \exists x \in X, F_u(x, y) \leq r\}.$$

We have to prove that  $(0_Y, -1) \notin \bigcap_{u \in U} \overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}_u)$ . Setting  $G = \sup_{u \in U} F_u$  we have that

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_{u \in U} \mathcal{F}_u, \text{ and } (0_Y, -1) \notin \mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{G}.$$

By Lemma 1 we obtain that

$$\sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in X.$$

Since the robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure is valid, there exists  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}) \in U \times Y^*$  such that

$$F_{\bar{u}}(x, y) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, y \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in X \times Y.$$

Applying Lemma 2 for  $G = F_{\bar{u}}$  we obtain that

$$(0_Y, -1) \notin \overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}_{\bar{u}}).$$

[(ii)  $\implies$  (i)] Assume that  $(\mathfrak{A})$  holds. We have to check that  $(\mathfrak{B})$  holds. Setting  $G := \sup_{u \in U} F_u$ , we have  $\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_{u \in U} \mathcal{F}_u$  and

$$G(x, 0_Y) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in X.$$

By Lemma 1 we obtain that

$$(0_Y, -1) \notin \mathbb{R}_+ \bigcap_{u \in U} \mathcal{F}_u.$$

By (ii) it follows that

$$(0_Y, -1) \notin \bigcap_{u \in U} \overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}_u).$$

Then, by Lemma 2, we obtain that  $(\mathfrak{B})$  holds.  $\square$

In order to recover well-known results on the  $S_F$ -procedure, we recall that a subset  $C$  of some lchTvs space is said to be closed (resp. closed convex) regarding another subset  $D$  of the same space if  $\overline{C} \cap D = C \cap D$  (resp.,  $(\overline{\text{co}} C) \cap D = C \cap D$ ), see [2] (resp., [12]).

**Corollary 1** ([20, Theorem 2.1]) *Let  $F: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The  $S_F$ -procedure is valid,*
- (ii)  *$\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}$  is closed convex regarding  $\{(0_Y, -1)\}$ .*

**Proof** Let  $U = \{u\}$  be a singleton and  $F_u := F$ . The robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure is valid if and only if the  $S_F$ -procedure is valid. By Theorem 1 this holds if and only if  $(0_Y, -1) \notin [\overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F})] \setminus [\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}]$  that is, if and only if,

$$[\overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F})] \cap \{(0_Y, -1)\} = [\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}] \cap \{(0_Y, -1)\},$$

namely  $\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}$  is closed convex regarding  $\{(0_Y, -1)\}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2** ([20, Corollary 2.1]) Let  $F: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  be such that  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}}$  is convex. The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The  $S_F$ -procedure is valid,
- (ii)  $\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}$  is closed regarding  $\{(0_Y, -1)\}$ .

**Proof** Since  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}}$  is convex we have that

$$\overline{\text{co}} \mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F} = \overline{\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}}.$$

Therefore  $\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}$  is closed convex regarding  $\{(0_Y, -1)\}$  if and only if  $\mathbb{R}_+ \mathcal{F}$  is closed regarding  $\{(0_Y, -1)\}$ .  $\square$

### 3 Dual characterization of the robust generalized S-procedure

From now on  $X$  is a lcHtvs (as  $Y$ ) with topological dual  $X^*$ , whose null vectors are  $0_X$  and  $0_{X^*}$ , respectively. The only topology we consider in  $X^*$  (resp.  $X^* \times \mathbb{R}$ ) is the weak\*-topology.

Given  $F_u: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  for all  $u \in U$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} p(x) &:= \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y), \quad \forall x \in X, \\ q(x') &:= \inf_{(u, \mu) \in U \times Y^*} (F_u)^*(x', \mu), \quad \forall x' \in X^*, \end{aligned}$$

and consider the projection of  $\bigcup_{u \in U} \text{epi}(F_u)^*$  on  $X^* \times \mathbb{R}$ , namely

$$\mathcal{F}^\# = \{(x', s) \in X^* \times \mathbb{R} : \exists (u, \mu) \in U \times Y^*, (F_u)^*(x', \mu) \leq s\}.$$

One has (see, e.g., [4], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11])

$$\begin{aligned} q^*(x) &= \sup_{u \in U} (F_u)^{**}(x, 0_Y) \leq p(x) \text{ for all } x \in X, \\ \overline{\text{co}} \mathcal{F}^\# &\subset \text{epi } q^{**} \subset \text{epi } p^*, \\ \text{dom } q^* &= \left\{ a \in X : \sup_{u \in U} (F_u)^{**}(a, 0_Y) < +\infty \right\}, \\ \text{and, if } \text{dom } q^* \neq \emptyset, &\text{epi } q^{**} = \overline{\text{co}} \mathcal{F}^\#. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the statements (A), (B) read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A)} \quad &(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \text{epi } p^*, \\ \text{(B)} \quad &(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \mathcal{F}^\#, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that (B)  $\implies$  (A) derives from the inclusion  $\mathcal{F}^\# \subset \text{epi } p^*$ .

Consider now the statements

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A}^{**}) \quad &\sup_{u \in U} (F_u)^{**}(x, 0_Y) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in X, \\ \text{(B}^{**}) \quad &\exists (\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}) \in U \times Y^* : (F_{\bar{u}})^{**}(x, y) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, y \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in X \times Y. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (A<sup>\*\*</sup>) reads

$$\text{(A}^{**}) \quad (0_{X^*}, 0) \in \text{epi } q^{**}.$$

Note that, since  $((F_{\bar{u}})^{**})^* = (F_{\bar{u}})^*$ , (B<sup>\*\*</sup>) coincides with (B).

**Theorem 2** Consider the following statements:

- (i) The robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure is valid.
- (ii) The robust  $S_{\{(F_u)^{**}\}_{u \in U}}$ -procedure is valid.
- (iii)  $\mathcal{F}^\#$  is weak\*-closed convex regarding  $\{(0_{X^*}, 0)\}$ .

We have (i)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\implies$  (iii).

If, moreover,

$$(H_1) \quad \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) = \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{u \in U} (F_u)^{**}(x, 0_Y) \neq +\infty$$

holds, then (i)  $\iff$  (ii)  $\iff$  (iii).

**Proof** [(i)  $\implies$  (ii)] Assume (i). Since  $(F_u)^{**} \leq F_u$  we have  $(\mathfrak{A}^{**}) \implies (\mathfrak{A})$ . By this and the fact that  $(\mathfrak{B}^{**}) \iff (\mathfrak{B})$ , we obtain (ii).

[(ii)  $\implies$  (iii)] Let  $(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \overline{\text{co}}\mathcal{F}^\#$ . We have  $(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \text{epi } q^{**}$ . This is  $(\mathfrak{A}^{**})$ . By (ii),  $(\mathfrak{B}^{**})$ , alias  $(\mathfrak{B})$ , holds, that is  $(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \mathcal{F}^\#$ .

[(iii)  $\implies$  (i)] Assume that  $(\mathfrak{A})$  holds. By  $(H_1)$  we have

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{u \in U} (F_u)^{**}(x, 0_Y) \geq 0,$$

that is  $(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \text{epi } q^{**}$ . By  $(H_1)$  we have also  $\text{dom } q^* \neq \emptyset$ . Consequently,  $(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \overline{\text{co}}\mathcal{F}^\#$  and, by (iii),  $(0_{X^*}, 0) \in \mathcal{F}^\#$ , that is  $(\mathfrak{B})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3** ([20, Theorem 4.1]) Given  $F: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , consider the following statements:

- (i) The  $S_F$ -procedure is valid.
- (ii) The  $S_{F^{**}}$ -procedure is valid.
- (iii)  $\{(x', s) \in X^* \times \mathbb{R} : \exists \mu \in Y^*, F^*(x', \mu) \leq s\}$  is weak\*-closed regarding  $\{(0_{X^*}, 0)\}$ .

We have (i)  $\implies$  (ii)  $\implies$  (iii).

If, moreover,

$$(H_2) \quad \inf_{x \in X} F(x, 0_Y) = \inf_{x \in X} F^{**}(x, 0_Y) \neq +\infty$$

holds, then (i)  $\iff$  (ii)  $\iff$  (iii).

**Proof** Apply Theorem 2 to the case that  $U = \{u\}$  is a singleton and  $F_u = F$ . We have

$$\mathcal{F}^\# = \{(x', s) \in X^* \times \mathbb{R} : \exists \mu \in Y^*, F^*(x', \mu) \leq s\}$$

that is the projection of  $\text{epi } F^*$  on  $X^* \times \mathbb{R}$ . Since the conjugate function  $F^*$  is convex, the set  $\mathcal{F}^\#$  is convex and the proof of Corollary 3 is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 1* Condition  $(H_1)$  (resp.  $(H_2)$ ) is in particular satisfied if  $(F_u)^{**}(x, 0_Y) = F_u(x, 0_Y)$  for all  $(u, x) \in U \times X$  (resp.  $F^{**}(x, 0_Y) = F(x, 0_Y)$  for all  $x \in X$ ), and  $\exists a \in X : \sup_{u \in U} F_u(a, 0_Y) \neq +\infty$  (resp.  $\exists a \in X : F(a, 0_Y) \neq +\infty$ ).



#### 4 Robust generalized S-procedure with RHS function in $\Gamma(X)$

In this section  $X, Y$  are lcHtvs,  $h \in \Gamma(X)$ , and  $F_u: X \times Y \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  for all  $u \in U$ . Let us recall the statements introduced in Section 1:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{A}_h) \quad & \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) \geq h(x) \text{ for all } x \in X, \\ (\mathfrak{B}_h) \quad & \forall a' \in \text{dom } h^*, \exists (\bar{u}, \bar{\mu}) \in U \times Y^* : (F_{\bar{u}})^*(a', \bar{\mu}) \leq h^*(a'). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3** *One has  $(\mathfrak{B}_h) \implies (\mathfrak{A}_h)$ .*

**Proof** Assume  $(\mathfrak{B}_h)$ . For all  $(x, a') \in X \times X^*$  there exists  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\mu}) \in U \times Y^*$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) &\geq F_{\bar{u}}(x, 0_Y) \geq (F_{\bar{u}})^{**}(x, 0_Y) \\ &\geq \langle a', x \rangle + \langle \bar{\mu}, 0_Y \rangle - (F_{\bar{u}})^*(a', \bar{\mu}) \\ &\geq \langle a', x \rangle - h^*(a'). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum on all  $a' \in \text{dom } h^*$  we obtain that  $(\mathfrak{A}_h)$  holds.  $\square$

The next result involves the graph of  $h^*$ , that is,  $\text{gph } h^* := \{(a', h^*(a')), a' \in \text{dom } h^*\}$ .

**Theorem 3** *Assume that*

$$(H_3) \quad \begin{cases} \forall a' \in \text{dom } h^*, \inf_{x \in X} \left( \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) - \langle a', x \rangle \right) \\ = \inf_{x \in X} \left( \sup_{u \in U} (F_u)^{**}(x, 0_Y) - \langle a', x \rangle \right) \neq +\infty \end{cases}$$

and

$$(H_4) \quad \mathcal{F}^\# \text{ is weak*-closed convex regarding } \text{gph } h^*$$

hold. Then, the robust  $S_{\{F_u\}_{u \in U}}^h$ -procedure is valid.

**Proof** One has to prove that  $(\mathfrak{A}_h) \implies (\mathfrak{B}_h)$ . Let  $a' \in \text{dom } h^*$ . We have

$$q^{**}(a') = \sup_{x \in X} \left( \langle a', x \rangle - \sup_{u \in U} (F_u)^{**}(x, 0_Y) \right)$$

and by  $(H_3)$ ,

$$q^{**}(a') = \sup_{x \in X} \left( \langle a', x \rangle - \sup_{u \in U} F_u(x, 0_Y) \right).$$

By  $(\mathfrak{A}_h)$  we obtain that

$$q^{**}(a') \leq \sup_{x \in X} (\langle a', x \rangle - h(x)),$$

that is  $(a', h^*(a')) \in \text{epi } q^{**}$ . Since  $\text{dom } q^* \neq \emptyset$  (see  $(H_3)$ ), it ensures that

$$(a', h^*(a')) \in \overline{\text{co}} \mathcal{F}^\#,$$

and, by  $(H_4)$ ,

$$(a', h^*(a')) \in \mathcal{F}^\# \text{ for all } a' \in \text{dom } h^*,$$

that is  $(\mathfrak{B}_h)$ .  $\square$

We conclude with the determinist case when  $U = \{u\}$ ,  $F_u = F: X \times Y \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}^\# = \{(x', s) \in X^* \times \mathbb{R} : \exists \mu \in Y^*, F^*(x', \mu) \leq s\}$ , and  $h \in \Gamma(X)$ . The corresponding statements are

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{A}_h) \quad & F(x, 0_Y) \geq h(x) \text{ for all } x \in X, \\ (\mathbb{B}_h) \quad & \forall a' \in \text{dom } h^*, \exists \mu \in Y^* : F^*(a', \mu) \leq h^*(a'). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3 we have  $(\mathbb{B}_h) \implies (\mathbb{A}_h)$ . The so-called  $S_F^h$ -procedure is said to be *valid* if  $(\mathbb{A}_h) \iff (\mathbb{B}_h)$ , or, equivalently,  $(\mathbb{A}_h) \implies (\mathbb{B}_h)$ .

**Corollary 4** *Assume that*

$$(H_5) \quad \begin{cases} \forall a' \in \text{dom } h^*, \inf_{x \in X} (F(x, 0_Y) - \langle a', x \rangle) \\ = \inf_{x \in X} (F^{**}(x, 0_Y) - \langle a', x \rangle) \neq +\infty \end{cases}$$

and

$$(H_6) \quad \begin{cases} \text{The set } \{(x', s) \in X^* \times \mathbb{R} : \exists \mu \in Y^*, F^*(x', \mu) \leq s\} \\ \text{is weak}^*\text{-closed regarding } \text{gph } h^* \end{cases}$$

hold. Then, the  $S_F^h$ -procedure is valid.

**Proof** Apply Theorem 3, noticing that  $\mathcal{F}^\#$  is convex.  $\square$

*Remark 2* Condition  $(H_5)$  is in particular satisfied if  $F(x, 0_Y) = F^{**}(x, 0_Y)$  for all  $x \in X$  and there exists  $a \in X$  such that  $F(a, 0_Y) \neq +\infty$ .

**Acknowledgements** This work is partly supported by the project “Generalized Farkas lemma for a family of adjustable systems with uncertainty and applications”, Vietnam National University-Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam.

## References

1. Aizerman, M.A., Gantmakher, F.R.: Absolute Stability of the Control Systems. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Moscow (1963)
2. Bot, R.I.: Conjugate Duality in Convex Optimization. Springer, Berlin (2010)
3. De Lara, M.: Duality between Lagrangians and Rockafellians. J. Convex Anal. **30**, 887-896 (2023)
4. De Lara, M., Hiriart-Urruty, J.-B.: A fresh geometrical look at the general  $S$ -procedure. Optimization Letters **16**, 1129-1135 (2022)
5. Derinkuyu, K., Pinar, M.C.: On the  $S$ -procedure and some variants. Math. Meth. Oper. Res. **64**, 5-77 (2006)
6. Descartes, R.: Principia Philosophiae (Latin). Ludovicus Elzevirius, Amsterdam, 1644.
7. Dinh, N., Goberna, M.A., López, M.A., Volle, M.: Convexity and closedness in stable robust duality. Optimization Letters **13**, 325-339 (2019)
8. Dinh, N., Goberna, M.A., López, M.A., Volle, M.: Characterizations of robust and stable duality for linear perturbed uncertain optimization problems. In: Bailey, D.H., et al. (eds.) From Analysis to Visualization: A Celebration of the Life and Legacy of Jonathan M. Borwein, pp. 43-74. Springer, Cham (2020)
9. Dinh, N., Goberna, M.A., Volle, M.: Around a Farkas-type lemma. Optimization **73**, 3609-3625 (2024)
10. Dinh, N., Goberna, M.A., Volle, M.: Primal and dual characterizations for Farkas type lemmas in terms of closedness criteria (submitted)  
<http://arxiv.org/abs/2503.04226>

11. Dinh, N., Mo, T.H., Vallet, G., Volle, M.: A unified approach to robust Farkas-type results with applications to robust optimization problems. *SIAM J. Optim.* **27**, 1075-1101 (2017)
12. Ernst, E., Volle, M.: Zero duality gap and attainment with possibly nonconvex data. *J. Convex Anal.* **23**, 615-629 (2016)
13. Gusev, S.V., Likhtarnikov, A.L.: Kalman-Popov-Yakubovich lemma and the *S*-procedure: A historical essay. *Autom. Remote Control* **67**, 1768-1810 (2006)
14. Liebling, Th.M., Pournin, L.: Voronoi Diagrams and Delaunay Triangulations: Ubiquitous Siamese Twins. *Documenta Mathematica (Extra Volume ISMP)* 419-431 (2012).
15. Newton, I.: *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* (Latin), 1687 [Principia, Book 3, General Scholium, at p.392 in Volume 2 of Andrew Motte's English translation published 1729]
16. Pólik, I., Terlaky, T.: A Survey of the S-Lemma. *SIAM Rev.* **49**, 371-418 (2007)
17. Rockafellar, R.T.: *Conjugate Duality and Optimization*. SIAM, Philadelphia (1974)
18. Royset, J.O., Wet, R.J.-B.: *An Optimization Primer*. Springer, Cham (2021)
19. Rudin, W.: *Functional Analysis*, 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, New York (1991)
20. Volle, M., Barro, M.: General formulation of the *S*-procedure. *J. Convex Anal.* **31**, 1289-1304 (2024)
21. Yakubovich, V.A.: *S*-procedure in nonlinear control theory (Russian). *Vestnik Leningrad. Univ.* **1**, 62-77 (1971)
22. Zălinescu, C.: *Convex Analysis in General Vector Spaces*. World Scientific, River Edge, NJ (2002)