

A CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH TO STRENGTHEN ALGEBRAIC DESCRIPTIONS OF FUNCTION AND OPERATOR CLASSES

Anne Rubbens*, Julien M. Hendrickx*, Adrien Taylor†

Abstract It is well known that functions (resp. operators) satisfying a property p on a subset $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ cannot necessarily be extended to a function (resp. operator) satisfying p on the whole of \mathbb{R}^d . Given $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, this work considers the problem of obtaining necessary and ideally sufficient conditions to be satisfied by a function (resp. operator) on Q , ensuring the existence of an extension of this function (resp. operator) satisfying p on \mathbb{R}^d .

More precisely, given some property p , we present a refinement procedure to obtain stronger necessary conditions to be imposed on Q . This procedure can be applied iteratively until the stronger conditions are also sufficient. We illustrate the procedure on a few examples, including the strengthening of existing descriptions for the classes of smooth functions satisfying a Łojasiewicz condition, convex blockwise smooth functions, Lipschitz monotone operators, strongly monotone cocoercive operators, and uniformly convex functions.

In most cases, these strengthened descriptions can be represented, or relaxed, to semi-definite constraints, which can be used to formulate tractable optimization problems on functions (resp. operators) within those classes.

1 INTRODUCTION

This work addresses the question of extending functions and operators within certain classes. Before formally stating this problem in Section 2.1, we informally describe it, considering function classes only. Informally, let $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a set of functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfying some algebraic property “ p ” everywhere. For instance, we say f belongs to the set of convex functions $\mathcal{F}_{p_{0,\infty}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if

$$(p_{0,\infty}) \quad f(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \leq \alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1].$$

There are generally several ways to describe a set of functions (i.e., via different properties). In the case of convex functions, one can, for instance, define the class via subdifferentials [45, Section 23]

$$(p'_{0,\infty}) \quad f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle g_x, y - x \rangle \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \exists g_x \in \mathbb{R}^d : g_x \in \partial f(x).$$

In this context, given a set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we seek to answer the following question.

What conditions must a function f satisfy on Q to ensure existence of an *extension* of f that is identically equal to f on Q and belongs to $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$?

We refer to such necessary and sufficient conditions as *interpolation/extension conditions*. A necessary extension condition for $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is p itself, which is satisfied on Q by functions that admit an extension to \mathbb{R}^d . However, this is not always sufficient since p can be satisfied on Q by functions that are not consistent with any function in $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, see, e.g., [52, Figure 1] for the case of smooth convex functions.

*ICTEAM Institute, UCLouvain, Belgium. name.surname@uclouvain.be.

†INRIA, École normale supérieure, CNRS, PSL Research University, France. adrien.taylor@inria.fr.

In addition, several properties $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, \dots$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{p^{(1)}}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathcal{F}_{p^{(2)}}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \dots$ are generally not equivalent when imposed on sets $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We refer to such a condition as being *stronger* than another if the set of functions satisfying it on Q is contained within the set of functions satisfying the other condition on Q . Given a property p , the strongest property p' such that $\mathcal{F}_{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a sufficient condition for extension to $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, satisfied on Q exactly by functions admitting an extension to \mathbb{R}^d .

We illustrate the different stages of this work via the running example of smooth convex functions.

Example. The class $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of L -smooth convex functions on \mathbb{R}^d can be described in numerous equivalent ways, see, e.g., [42, Section 2.1.1]. Arguably the most natural one consists in juxtaposing a convexity condition with Lipschitz continuity of the gradients, thereby obtaining a condition $p_{0,L}$ to be satisfied on \mathbb{R}^d by L -smooth convex functions f , in the sense that $p_{0,L}$ is negative, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(p_{0,L}) \quad p_{0,L}((x, f(x), \nabla f(x)), (y, f(y), \nabla f(y))) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} f(y) - f(x) + \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle \leq 0 \\ \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| - L\|x - y\| \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Another description of $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ consists in juxtaposing convexity and another definition of smoothness, obtained by integration of the Lipschitz continuity of the gradients, see, e.g., [42, Theorem 2.1.5], and imposing, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(p'_{0,L}) \quad p'_{0,L}((x, f(x), \nabla f(x)), (y, f(y), \nabla f(y))) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} f(y) - f(x) + \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle \leq 0 \\ f(x) - f(y) - \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle - \frac{L}{2}\|x - y\|^2 \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

By combining the two inequalities in $p'_{0,L}$, one can further show that $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be equivalently defined by the following single condition $p''_{0,L}$, see, e.g., [42, Theorem 2.1.5], to be imposed on all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(p''_{0,L}) \quad p''_{0,L}((x, f(x), \nabla f(x)), (y, f(y), \nabla f(y))) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow f(x) - f(y) - \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle - \frac{\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2}{2L} \leq 0.$$

These three definitions are equivalent when imposed on any pair in \mathbb{R}^d and are thus all necessary extension conditions when imposed on sets $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., on any pair $x, y \in Q$. However, they are not equivalent anymore when imposed on such smaller sets. In particular, $p''_{0,L}$ is stronger than both $p'_{0,L}$ and $p_{0,L}$, since one can find counterexamples which, on some sets $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, satisfy $p'_{0,L}$ or $p_{0,L}$, but do not admit an extension satisfying p to \mathbb{R}^d [52]. These two definitions are thus not sufficient extension conditions. On the contrary, it has been shown [52, Theorem 4] (see also [3, 13] for alternate viewpoints) that $p''_{0,L}$ is a necessary and sufficient extension property for $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., for any $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, functions satisfying $p''_{0,L}$ on Q are exactly those admitting a smooth convex extension to \mathbb{R}^d .

Motivation. Extension conditions are particularly relevant for problems where functions in some class $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are variables to certain optimization, (see, e.g., [43, 52]), or regression problems, (see, e.g., [26, 33]). In this situation, one typically only needs or has access to evaluations of the function at a discrete set of points $Q = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$, and requires this dataset to be consistent with a function in $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is then often easier to formulate conditions of existence of such functions in $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by imposing conditions on Q rather than on the full space \mathbb{R}^d , which would imply dealing with infinite-dimensional variables. Among others, this kind of discretization technique became popular for obtaining worst-case performance bounds for optimization methods in a computer-aided way [16, 51]. In this context, it has been shown that using conditions that guarantee extensibility/interpolation allows computing tight performance bounds. The same motivation holds for operators; see e.g., [48].

1.1 RELATED WORKS

Extension/interpolation conditions. The interest in extension conditions can be traced back to at least 1934, with [54] asking the question of whether or not a function with given properties, e.g., continuity, could be extended outside of its domain. The properties are formulated qualitatively, i.e., it is not required for the extension to satisfy the property with the same parameters as the initial function. In this context, extension conditions were obtained, e.g., for non-negative functions [18], Lipschitz continuous functions [24] and convex functions [3, 4, 5, 55].

The quest for interpolation conditions to obtain exact performance guarantees on optimization methods started in 2017 with smooth (weakly) convex functions [51, 52]. In this context, initial functions and extensions are required to satisfy properties with the same parameters. Building on this work, such conditions were then obtained, e.g., for smooth Lipschitz functions [50], indicator functions of (strongly) convex sets [36, 50, 51], difference-of-convex functions and relatively smooth and convex functions [14], and (strongly) monotone, cocoercive, Lipschitz or linear operators [12, 48], and for a variety of other classes of functions (see, e.g., [25, 23] and a partial list provided in the, [PEPit documentation](#) [22]). A comparison of the different versions of an interpolation condition arising from these contexts is provided in [47, Section 2]. Natural consequences of knowing (or not knowing) interpolation conditions in the context of first-order optimization are discussed at length in, e.g., [50, 21].

To this date, however, obtaining extension conditions for specific function (resp. operator) classes remains a challenge. In particular, there exists no principled way (i) to strengthen a non-sufficient candidate extension condition or to prove it is sufficient, nor (ii) to combine extension conditions associated with several properties, as showcased in [52, Section 2.2] and [48, Section 2.2].

Positive polynomials: SOS and co-positive formulations. Throughout this work, we propose descriptions of classes that can be expressed as *convex* conditions to be imposed on a dataset (discrete version of functions/operators) and reformulate/relax these conditions to obtain *tractable* forms for them. In particular, for some $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, these convex conditions are often expressed as n -dimensional polynomials of degree k : $P(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}_k[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n]$, whose coefficients depend on the dataset, and which must be non-positive for all $\theta \geq 0$. Representing convex expressions, and in particular (co)-positive polynomials, in tractable/nontractable ways has been a long-lasting subject of interest, and we quickly mention a few key techniques.

Setting $\gamma = \theta^2$, enforcing $P(\theta) \leq 0, \forall \theta \geq 0$ is equivalent to enforcing a n -dimensional polynomial of degree $2k$, $\bar{P}(\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}_{2k}[\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n]$ to be non-positive everywhere. Interest in non-negative polynomials can be traced back to 1888 [27], and they have been widely studied since; see, e.g., [34, 37] for surveys. While the set of non-negative polynomials is non-tractable in general, it can be relaxed in several tractable ways, e.g., by requiring polynomials to be *sum of squares* (SOS). That is, there exists a matrix $M \succcurlyeq 0$ such that $\bar{P}(\gamma) = -X^T M X$, where X is a vector of size $\binom{k+n}{n}$ containing all monomials of degree $\leq k$ in γ . It is well-known that for the special cases $(n = 1, k \in \mathbb{N})$, $(n \in \mathbb{N}, k = 1)$ and $(n = 2, k = 2)$, non-negative and SOS polynomials are equivalent [27]. In any case, the set of SOS polynomials provides a natural path to tractable convex relaxations of positive polynomials in general. Alternatively, when $n = 1$, one can use the Markov-Lukasc theorem, see, e.g., [49, Theorem 1.21], to express non-negativity of polynomials as SDPs.

Finally, in some cases, enforcing $P(\theta) \leq 0, \forall \theta \geq 0$ can be equivalently formulated as requiring existence of a *co-positive* matrix M (i.e., $x^T M x \geq 0, \forall x \geq 0$), such that $P(\theta) = -X(\theta)^T M X(\theta)$ for some vector $X(\theta)$. Co-positive programming has been widely investigated since 1952 [39], see, e.g., [17] for a survey. While certifying the co-positivity of a matrix is generally *NP-hard*, it is semi-definite representable for small problem dimensions (≤ 4 , see, e.g., [38]) and can naturally be relaxed to tractable convex representations otherwise.

1.2 CONTRIBUTIONS

We propose a systematic approach for searching extension conditions for given classes $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, starting from p itself. To do so, we constructively and iteratively *strengthen* p via a refinement procedure. That is, we iteratively propose alternative conditions $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, \dots$ that are equivalent to p on \mathbb{R}^d but stronger than p on subsets $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Those alternatives become stronger and stronger as we proceed (i.e., the sets of functions satisfying them get smaller). This technique naturally complements the constructive approach to counterexamples proposed in [47].

The contribution of this work is twofold. First, Section 2 presents the refinement technique, and illustrates it on the class of smooth convex functions, providing an original approach (not relying on integration arguments) to obtain $p''_{0,L}$ from $p_{0,L}$. Then, Section 3 exploits the technique to obtain new conditions for function and operator classes that have sparked interest in the optimization community (see, e.g., [2, 10, 15, 30, 40, 41, 42, 48]) and for which no extension condition yet exists. These refined conditions are obtained via a single round of the refinement procedure, and are hence a priori only necessary extension conditions. However, we show on several examples how they quantitatively improve upon classical descriptions. In addition, we provide, for most cases, SDP representations (in terms of the conditions imposed on a dataset) of those refined conditions. In particular, we strengthen existing descriptions of

- smooth functions satisfying a Łojasiewicz condition, see, e.g., [9, 10, 11, 35, 44] for motivations, and [2] for recent analyses of the gradient method on this class: SDP formulation (Section 3.1),
- convex blockwise smooth functions, see, e.g., [8, 40] for motivations, and [1, 29] for recent analysis of the cyclic or randomized blockwise coordinate descent methods on this class: SDP formulation (Section 3.2),
- Lipschitz strongly monotone operators, see, e.g., [7, 48] for motivations, and [19, 20, 32] for recent analysis of the extra gradient and optimistic gradient on this class: SDP formulation (Section 3.3),
- strongly monotone cocoercive operators, see, e.g., [7, 48] for motivations: SDP formulation (Appendix F),
- uniformly convex functions, see, e.g., [56] for an introduction and [28, 41] for applications (Appendix G),
- smooth convex functions defined on convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^d , i.e., it is not required for the extension to be defined everywhere, see, e.g., [15] for a study of this case (Appendix H).

1.3 NOTATION

We consider the standard Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d with standard inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and induced norm $\| \cdot \|$. Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\llbracket N \rrbracket = \{1, \dots, N\}$. Given a set $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $|Q|$ its cardinality, where $|Q| = |\mathbb{N}| = \aleph_0$ for Q countably infinite, $|Q| = |\mathbb{R}^d| = \mathfrak{c}$ for Q uncountable, and $K \leq \aleph_0 \leq \mathfrak{c}$, $\forall K \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a symmetric matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we denote by $M \succcurlyeq 0$ its positive definiteness. Given a convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we refer by $\partial f(x)$ to the subdifferential [45] of f at x , defined as the set of vectors $v_x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle v_x, y - x \rangle$. When clear from the context, we denote by v_x a subgradient of f at x (i.e., $v_x \in \partial f(x)$).

2 ITERATIVE STRENGTHENING OF A PROPERTY

2.1 FORMAL EXTENSION PROPERTY

This work considers properties that can be translated into one or several inequalities involving a finite number of points. Such properties can always be reduced to a single inequality, taking the supremum/maximum of the algebraic expressions among all points, see, e.g., $p_{0,L}$, $p'_{0,L}$ or $p''_{0,L}$.

Formally, let $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $F : Q \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^D \cup \emptyset$ a multi-valued mapping, and consider properties $p : (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^D)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We say F satisfies p at some tuple in Q^m if $p((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_m, F_{x_m})) \leq 0$, for all $F_{x_i} \in F(x_i)$, $i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket$.

Mapping classes. Given a property $p : (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^D)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and sets $Q \subseteq \bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we define families of mappings satisfying p on Q as

$$\mathcal{F}_p(Q) := \left\{ F : Q \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^D : p((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_m, F_{x_m})) \leq 0, \right. \\ \left. \text{for all tuples in } Q^m, \text{ and for all } F_{x_i} \in F(x_i), i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket \right\}.$$

As such, $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$ and $\mathcal{F}_p(Q)$ describe different objects and cannot be compared (as the mappings in $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$ and $\mathcal{F}_p(Q)$ are not defined on the same sets). We thus further introduce the family of mappings satisfying p on \bar{Q} , but restricted to Q , or equivalently, the mappings F satisfying p on Q , and admitting an extension to \bar{Q} , i.e. $\exists \bar{F} \in \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$ such that $\bar{F} = F$ on Q .

$$\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})|_Q := \{ F : Q \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^D : \exists \bar{F} \in \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q}) : F(x) = \bar{F}(x), \forall x \in Q \}.$$

Interpolation/extension properties. Clearly, $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})|_Q \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p(Q)$ always holds, but the contrary is not necessarily true, as some mappings $F \in \mathcal{F}_p(Q)$ may not admit an extension $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$. Such mappings thus satisfy p on Q but cannot be extended to \bar{Q} in a way as to still satisfy p , see, e.g., the example of smooth convex functions [52, Figure 1].

Given a property p , we search for a property $\tilde{p}_{\bar{Q}}$ such that (i) $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q}) = \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$, and (ii) mappings satisfying $\tilde{p}_{\bar{Q}}$ on any $Q \subseteq \bar{Q}$ always admit an extension in $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{\bar{Q}}}(Q) = \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q})|_Q = \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})|_Q, \forall Q \subseteq \bar{Q} : Q \text{ countable}.$$

We denote such a condition $\tilde{p}_{\bar{Q}}$ an *interpolation condition* for $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$.

Definition 2.1 (Interpolation/extension condition). Given $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and a property p , we say p is an interpolation condition for $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$ if

$$\forall Q \subseteq \bar{Q}, Q \text{ countable} : \forall F \in \mathcal{F}_p(Q), \exists F' \in \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q}) \text{ such that } F(x) = F'(x) \forall x \in Q.$$

A detailed discussion on differences between this definition and classical ones [52, Definition 2] is provided in [47, Section 2].

Goal and method. Starting from a condition p , a domain $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}, K \leq |\bar{Q}|$, we seek to obtain an interpolation condition for $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$, which can be p itself. To this end, we construct a sequence of properties $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, \dots, p^{(T)}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{p^{(i)}}(\bar{Q}) = \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$, but iteratively *stronger* on \bar{Q} , in the sense that on all $Q \subseteq \bar{Q}$, $p^{(i+1)}$ is satisfied by less mappings than $p^{(i)}$: $\mathcal{F}_{p^{(i+1)}}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p^{(i)}}(Q)$, $\forall Q \subseteq \bar{Q}$. Ideally, we hope that the iterative refinement procedure admits a limiting property $p^{(\infty)}$ that will be an interpolation condition.

2.2 ONE-POINT STRENGTHENINGS

Consider a property $p : (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^D)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a domain $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and some $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \leq K \leq |\bar{Q}|$. We take a first step into obtaining an interpolation condition for $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$ and build from p a stronger definition of this class, which ensures that any mapping $F \in \mathcal{F}_p(Q')$ where $Q' \subseteq \bar{Q}$ and $|Q'| = K$, admits an extension satisfying p to any $z \in \bar{Q}$. Requiring an extension to any $z \in \bar{Q}$ individually is weaker than requiring an extension to \bar{Q} , i.e., an extension to any $z \in \bar{Q}$ simultaneously.

We denote by $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}} : (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^D)^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such a stronger definition, that thus satisfies (i) $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q}) = \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$, (ii) $\forall Q \subseteq \bar{Q}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p(Q)$, and (iii) $\forall Q' \subseteq \bar{Q}: |Q'| = K$, and for any $z \in \bar{Q}, F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(Q') \Leftrightarrow F \in \mathcal{F}_p(Q' \cup z)|_{Q'}$. Observe that the number of points and mapping values taken as arguments by p and $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$, respectively, varies from m to K .

We construct $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ as follows. Given $Q' = \{(x_1, \dots, x_K)\} \subseteq \bar{Q}$, $|Q'| = K$, $F \in \mathcal{F}_p(Q')$, and $z \in \bar{Q}$, it is possible to extend F from Q' to z if there exists some $F_z \in \mathbb{R}^D$ compatible with p and F on Q' , i.e., if and only if

$$0 \geq \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ F_z \in \mathbb{R}^D}} \{ \tau \text{ s.t. } p(\pi((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_{m-1}, F_{x_{m-1}}), (z, F_z))) \leq \tau, \\ \forall \text{ tuple in } Q'^{m-1}, F_{x_i} \in F(x_i), i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket, \text{ and permutation } \pi \}.$$

Since this must hold for any $z \in \bar{Q}$, $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ should enforce it for the “worst” z , i.e.,

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \geq \max_{z \in \bar{Q}} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ F_z \in \mathbb{R}^D}} \{ \tau \text{ s.t. } p(\pi((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_{m-1}, F_{x_{m-1}}), (z, F_z))) \leq \tau, \\ \forall \text{ tuple in } Q'^{m-1}, F_{x_i} \in F(x_i), i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket, \text{ and permutation } \pi \}.$$

Letting $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ be the solution to the optimization problem defined in (2.1) implies that any $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(Q')$, hence satisfying $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_K, F_{x_K})) \leq 0$, admits an extension in $\mathcal{F}_p(Q' \cup z)$, for any $z \in \bar{Q}$. In particular, letting $z \in Q'$ naturally implies $F \in \mathcal{F}_p(Q')$.

We now formally define $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ and prove that $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q}) = \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$, and $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ is stronger than p on \bar{Q} , before illustrating the definition on the example of smooth convex functions.

Definition 2.2 (K -wise one-point strengthening). Consider a property $p : (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^D)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and $K \in \mathbb{N}, m \leq K \leq |\bar{Q}|$. We define $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}} : (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^D)^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the K -wise one-point strengthening of p with respect to \bar{Q} , as

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_K, F_{x_K})) = \max_{z \in \bar{Q}} \min_{F_z \in \mathbb{R}^D, \tau \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \tau \text{ s.t. } p(\pi((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_{m-1}, F_{x_{m-1}}), (z, F_z))) \leq \tau, \\ \forall \text{ tuple in } \{x_1, \dots, x_K\}^{m-1}, \text{ permutation } \pi, \\ \text{and } \forall F_{x_i} \in F(x_i), i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket \}.$$

Lemma 2.3. Given $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $K \in \mathbb{N}, K \leq |\bar{Q}|$, consider a property p and its one-point strengthening $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$, as defined in (2.2). Then, $\forall Q \subseteq \bar{Q}, \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p(Q)$, and $\mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q}) = \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q})$.

Proof. Taking $z \in Q$ in (2.2), it holds that all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(Q)$ satisfy p on Q , hence the first implication holds. Similarly, all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q})$ satisfy p on \bar{Q} , hence $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$.

Suppose now by contradiction the existence of some $F \in \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$ which does not belong to $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}}(\bar{Q})$. Then, at some $(x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}) \in \bar{Q}$, for some $F_{x_i} \in F(x_i)$, $i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket$, and for some permutation π , it holds that

$$0 < \max_{z \in \bar{Q}} \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, F_z \in \mathbb{R}^D} \tau \text{ s.t. } p(\pi((x_1, F_{x_1}), \dots, (x_{m-1}, F_{x_{m-1}}), (z, F_z))) \leq \tau.$$

Hence, at some $z \in \bar{Q}$ there exists no F_z extending p from (x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}) to z , in contradiction with the assumption $F \in \mathcal{F}_p(\bar{Q})$. \square

Remark 2.4. Definition 2.2 allows evaluating $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ on any set $Q \subseteq \bar{Q}$, by simply enforcing the solution to (2.2) to be non-positive for all tuples in Q^K . Alternatively, one can obtain a closed-form expression of $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ by computing the solution to (2.2) in a *parametric* way in $\{x_1, \dots, x_K\}$, i.e., keeping these as parameters. Evaluating $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ on any set $Q \subseteq \bar{Q}$ then reduces to simply imposing a set of conditions on $F : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$, without having to solve an optimization problem.

In what follows, when K, \bar{Q} are clear from the context, we drop the explicit dependence on K, \bar{Q} and denote $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ via the simpler \tilde{p} instead.

Example 2.5 (Smooth convex functions). Let $Q = \{(x_1, x_2)\}$ and $F : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1+d} : x_i \rightarrow (f_i, g_i)$, where g_i is a priori unrelated from f_i while meant to belong to its differential, see Remark 2.4. The 2-wise (pairwise) one-point strengthening of $p'_{0,L}$ with respect to \mathbb{R}^d is given by

($\tilde{p}'_{0,L}$)

$$\tilde{p}'_{0,L}((x_1, f_1, g_1), (x_2, f_2, g_2)) = \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_z \in \mathbb{R}}} \tau \text{ s.t. } f_z - f_i - \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|z - x_i\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2$$

$$f_i - f_z + \langle g_z, z - x_i \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|z - x_i\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2$$

$$f_z - f_i - \langle g_z, z - x_i \rangle \leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2$$

$$f_i - f_z + \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle \leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Stability of a strengthening. Given $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \leq |\bar{Q}|$, and starting from a given property p , one can strengthen p by iteratively computing one-point strengthenings $p^{(1)} = \tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$, $p^{(2)} = \tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}^{(1)}$, \dots , with the goal of reaching a property $p_{K,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}$ that is *stable under K -wise one-point strengthening*, i.e., $p_{K,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)} = \tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}$ in the sense that $\mathcal{F}_{p_{K,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}}(Q) = \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}}(Q)$, $\forall Q \subseteq \bar{Q}$.

Definition 2.6 (Stability under one-point strengthening). Given $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \leq |\bar{Q}|$, and a property p , we say p is *stable under K -wise one-point strengthening* with respect to \bar{Q} if $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}} = p$, where $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ is defined in (2.2).

The iterative procedure can, for instance, reach such a stable property in finite time, see, e.g., Proposition 2.8, or as a limit to which the sequence of properties, under their closed-form, converges, see, e.g., Proposition 2.9.

K -wise one-point extensible properties and extension properties. The final property of the refinement procedure, $p^{(\infty)}$, is K -wise one-point extensible, in the sense that it can be extended from any subset $Q \subseteq \bar{Q}$ of cardinality K , to any $z \in \bar{Q}$. To obtain a *global one-point extensible property* for \bar{Q} , i.e., a property that can be extended from any finite subset to any additional point, it then suffices to relaunch the procedure for a sequence of larger and larger K , i.e., $K_1 \leq K_2 \leq \dots \leq |\bar{Q}|$, with typically $K_i = K_{i-1} + 1$, to obtain a sequence $p_{K_1,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}, p_{K_2,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}, \dots, p_{K_k,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}$, where each $p_{K_k,\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}$ is computed by initializing the procedure at $p_{K_i,\bar{Q}}^{(0)} = p_{K_{i-1},\bar{Q}}^{(\infty)}$.

In addition, under reasonable regularity assumptions, interpolation conditions and global one-point extensible conditions are equivalent [47, Theorem 2].

2.3 COMPUTING OF ONE-POINT STRENGTHENINGS

Starting from a given p , obtaining $\tilde{p}_{K,\bar{Q}}$ requires the ability to solve (2.2). We tackle this task by dualizing the inner problem in (2.2), which can be done explicitly for a range of natural conditions used in the optimization community. Afterwards, whenever there is no duality gap, solving (2.2) amounts

to solving a single maximization problem, whose number of variables grows with the number of inequalities in p , and K . There is no general recipe to solve this maximization problem, which often admits several solutions that can lose the initial structure of p in F , e.g., linearity.

Hence, in most cases, we do not solve (2.2) exactly but instead propose relaxations of $\tilde{p}_{K,\tilde{Q}}$, which might not be optimal solutions to (2.2), but are nevertheless stronger properties than p . In particular, we often conserve only a limited number of non-zero dual coefficients for the inner problem. Then, when the resulting conditions are polynomials in the remaining coefficients (see Proposition 3.1 describing initial constraints for which it is the case), we reformulate/relax them as SDPs, see Section 1.1. Alternatively, one can choose to impose particular numerical values for the non-zero coefficients. Both relaxations of $\tilde{p}_{K,\tilde{Q}}$ conserve the same structure in terms of F as p and can thus be straightforwardly relied upon when imposed on datasets that are variables to given optimization problems.

Remark 2.7. Note that relaxing $\tilde{p}_{K,\tilde{Q}}$ involves trading off between (i) obtaining conditions as close as possible to $\tilde{p}_{K,\tilde{Q}}$, e.g., via convex reformulations (e.g., co-positive reformulations, semi-definite, etc.), and (ii) obtaining conditions whose one-point strengthening are easily computable.

For similar reasons, we are, in general, not able to prove stability of a one-point strengthening. For exploring this venue, we provide some insight into the iterative process on two examples for which extension conditions are known: that of smooth convex functions (see Section 2.5) and that of Lipschitz operators (see Appendix A).

2.4 OPERATOR AND FUNCTION CLASSES

Section 2.1 introduced the proposed iterative refinement procedure in a general context. For the sake of readability, we now introduce lighter notation related to the cases we analyze in what follows.

Function classes and differentially consistent properties. We first consider function classes characterized by properties involving function values and first-order derivatives, e.g., the class of L -smooth convex functions and its definition $p''_{0,L}$. Mappings of interest then take the form $F : Q \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{1+d} : x \rightrightarrows (f(x), g(x)) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. While meant to satisfy $g(x) \in \partial f(x)$, the mappings $g(x)$ and $f(x)$ are *a priori* unrelated, other than satisfying a certain algebraic relationship. We call a property p whose satisfaction everywhere implies $g(x) \in \partial f(x)$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *differentially consistent* [47, Definition 2]. We denote by $S = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in I}$ for an index set I the set of points Q together with the associated value of mapping $F \in \mathcal{F}_p(Q)$ to be extended, where a multivalued mapping is accounted for by letting several points in S be equal, with different associated values of g_i 's.

Compact notation for a property and its strengthening. For any property p , we denote (i) with an index (e.g., p_α) the possible parameters for this property, (ii) with a superscript the points at which it is evaluated (e.g., $p_\alpha^{xy} = p_\alpha((x, f(x), g(x)), (y, f(y), g(y)))$ or $p_\alpha^{ij} = p_\alpha((x_i, f_i, g_i), (x_j, f_j, g_j))$), (iii) with a tilde the corresponding one-point strengthening (2.2) of p (e.g., \tilde{p}_α the one-point strengthening of p_α obtained by (2.2)), and (iv) with a superscript in between parentheses the iterates of the one-point strengthening procedure (e.g., $p_\alpha^{(i+1)} = \tilde{p}_\alpha^{(i)}$)—we never use two types of superscripts simultaneously.

Operator classes. Section 3.3 and Section F provide examples of property strengthenings for the case of operators (as opposed to functions). Mappings of interest take the form $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d : x \rightarrow t(x)$, and in this case we denote by $S = \{(x_i, t_i)\}_{i \in I}$ the dataset to be extended, where again a multivalued mapping is accounted for by letting several points in S be equal, with different associated t_i 's. To avoid notation clashes, we refer to properties of operators using the letter q instead of p , with all variations around this notation also used (e.g., q_α and its one-point strengthening \tilde{q}_α).

Finally, we denote 2-wise by pairwise, 3-wise by terwise, etc..

2.5 EXAMPLE: SMOOTH CONVEX FUNCTIONS

This section illustrates the refinement procedure on a known and well-studied case: that of smooth convex functions ([42]). We argue that it is a perfect example to illustrate how the technique can be used, as interpolation conditions $p''_{0,L}$ are known for this class. We show how to obtain $p''_{0,L}$, first from $p'_{0,L}$ and then from the most natural definition $p_{0,L}$, without resorting to integration—which is the classical way to obtain those inequalities, albeit arguably not a natural argument given the nature of the problem. To this end, consider first the following one-point strengthening.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $Q = \{(x_1, x_2)\}$ and consider $p'_{0,L}$. Denote by $\tilde{p}'_{0,L}$ the pairwise one-point strengthening of $p'_{0,L}$ on \mathbb{R}^d . It holds that $\tilde{p}'_{0,L} = p''_{0,L}$.*

Proof. The one-point strengthening of $p'_{0,L}$, $\tilde{p}'_{0,L}$, can be relaxed to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}'_{0,L}{}^{ij} &\geq \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_z \in \mathbb{R}}} \tau \text{ s.t. } f_z - f_i - \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|z - x_i\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2 & (\lambda_i) \\ f_j - f_z + \langle g_j, z - x_j \rangle &\leq \tau, \quad j = 1, 2. & (\mu_j) \end{aligned}$$

where λ_i and μ_j are the associated dual coefficients. Setting $\lambda_j = \mu_i = 0$, $\lambda_i = \mu_j = \frac{1}{2}$ for some choice $i \neq j = 1, 2$, and dualizing the inner problem yields

$$\tilde{p}'_{0,L}{}^{ij} \geq \frac{1}{2} \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} f_j + \langle g_j, z - x_j \rangle - f_i - \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle - \frac{L}{2} \|z - x_i\|^2,$$

which is maximized in $z = x_i + \frac{g_j - g_i}{L}$, hence

$$0 \geq \tilde{p}'_{0,L}{}^{ij} \Leftrightarrow 0 \geq f_j - f_i + \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{2L} \|g_j - g_i\|^2 \Leftrightarrow 0 \geq p''_{0,L}{}^{ij}.$$

Starting from $p'_{0,L}$, we thus recover $p''_{0,L}$ after a single round of one-point strengthenings. As a second step in our example, we show how to recover $p''_{0,L}$ from $p_{0,L}$, which requires several iterations of one-point strengthenings that all share the same structure. Figure 1 illustrates the iterative refinement procedure for $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}$. We first present a single iteration of the strengthening procedure starting with $p_{0,L}$ (when $\alpha = 0$). □

Proposition 2.9. *Consider $Q = \{(x_1, x_2)\}$, $\alpha \geq 0$, and p_α a pairwise condition defined by $\forall i, j = 1, 2$,*

$$(p_\alpha) \quad p_\alpha^{ij} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} f_i \geq f_j + \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2 \\ \|g_i - g_j\|^2 \leq L^2 \|x_i - x_j\|^2. \end{cases}$$

Then, \tilde{p}_α , the pairwise one-point strengthening of p_α with respect to \mathbb{R}^d , is satisfied only if, $\forall i, j = 1, 2$,

$$(2.3) \quad \tilde{p}_\alpha^{ij} \leq 0 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} f_i \geq f_j + \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{(1+\alpha)/2}{2L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2 \\ \|g_i - g_j\|^2 \leq L^2 \|x_i - x_j\|^2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The one-point strengthening of p_α is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_\alpha(f, Q) &= \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_z \in \mathbb{R}}} \tau \text{ s.t. } -f_z + f_i + \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2L} \|g_i - g_z\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2 & (\lambda_i) \\ -f_i + f_z - \langle g_z, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2L} \|g_i - g_z\|^2 &\leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2 & (\mu_i) \\ \frac{1}{2L} \|g_z - g_i\|^2 - \frac{L}{2} \|z - x_i\|^2 &\leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2, & (\delta_i) \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_i, \mu_i, \delta_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are the associated dual coefficients. Dualization of the inner problem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_\alpha(f, Q) \geq & \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \lambda_i, \mu_i, \delta_i \geq 0, \\ \sum_i (\lambda_i + \mu_i + \delta_i) = 1}} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\lambda_i (f_i + \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle) + \frac{\alpha}{2L} \|g_i - g_z^\star\|^2 \right) \\ & + \mu_i (-f_i - \langle g_z^\star, z - x_i \rangle) + \frac{\alpha}{2L} \|g_i - g_z^\star\|^2 + \frac{\delta_i}{2L} (\|g_z^\star - g_i\|^2 - L^2 \|z - x_i\|^2) \\ \text{s.t. } 0 = & \sum_{i=1}^2 (\lambda_i - \mu_i), \\ 0 = & \sum_{i=1}^2 \left((\mu_i + \lambda_i) \frac{\alpha}{L} (g_z^\star - g_i) - \mu_i (z - x_i) + \frac{\delta_i}{L} (g_z^\star - g_i) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where g_z^\star minimizes the inner problem in \tilde{p}_α .

In particular, setting $\lambda_i = 0, \mu_i = 0, \delta_i = \frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, 2$, $g_z^\star = \frac{g_1 + g_2}{2}$ and $z = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}$ yields a feasible solution of $\|g_1 - g_2\|^2 - L^2 \|x_1 - x_2\|^2$, hence \tilde{p}_α cannot be satisfied unless this quantity is negative. In addition, setting $\lambda_i = 0, \mu_j = 0, \delta_j = 0, \lambda_j = \mu_i = \delta_i = \frac{1}{3}$, $z = x_i + \frac{g_j - g_i}{2L}$ and $g_z^\star = \frac{g_i + g_j}{2}$ yields a feasible solution of $-f_j + f_i + \langle g_i, x_j - x_i \rangle + \frac{1+\alpha}{2} \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2$, $i, j = 1, 2$. Hence, \tilde{p}_α is at least as strong as (2.3). \square

To recover $p''_{0,L}$ from $p_{0,L}$, it suffices to successively apply the one-point strengthening of Proposition 2.9, starting with $p^{(0)} = p_{0,L}$, to reach $p^{(\infty)} = p''_{0,L}$.

Proposition 2.10. Consider $Q = \{(x_1, x_2)\}$, $p_{0,L}$, the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=0,\dots}$, initiated at $\alpha_0 = 0$ and defined by

$$(2.4) \quad \alpha_{k+1} = \frac{\alpha_k + 1}{2},$$

and the associated sequence of conditions $\{p^{(k)}\}_{k=0,\dots} := \{p_{\alpha_k}\}_{k=0,\dots}$, where p_{α_k} is defined in p_α .

Then, $p^{(k+1)}$ is a relaxation of $\tilde{p}^{(k)}$ as defined in (2.3). In addition, $p^{(\infty)}$, the final result of the refinement procedure defined in Section 2.1, satisfies $p^{(\infty)} = \tilde{p}_{K,Q}^{(\infty)} = p_{\alpha(\infty)} = p_{\alpha=1} = p''_{0,L}$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.9 and definition of $\{(\alpha_k)\}_{k=0,\dots}$, the first statement holds.

In addition, $\{(\alpha_k)\}_{k=0,\dots}$ converges to $\alpha(\infty) = 1$. Hence, applying recursively Proposition 2.9 starting from $\alpha = 0$ allows iteratively strengthening p until $p^{(\infty)} = p_{\alpha(\infty)} = p''_{0,L}$, which is stable under one-point strengthening. \square

Concluding observations. In this example, the iterative strengthening procedure described in Section 2.1 converges towards the same property even when initialized from two different descriptions of $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This holds despite relaxations in the computations of the one-point strengthenings involved. In addition, in both cases, the iterative procedure even converges towards an interpolation condition for $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. However, the initial condition given to the procedure has a non-trivial impact on the number of iterations required to reach this condition, which varies from a single iteration to an asymptotic convergence. Note that the same observations apply to the other known case on which we applied the procedure: that of Lipschitz operators, presented in Appendix A.




Figure 1: From [47, Figure 1]. Given $L = 1$, $x_1 = f_1 = 0$, $g_1 = x_2 = 1$, allowed regions for f_2 as a function of g_2 , according to $p^{(i)} = p_{\alpha_i}$, $i = 0, \dots, 4$, where $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\alpha_{i+1} = (1 + \alpha_i)/2$, and p_{α_i} is defined in p_{α} , and according to $p^{(\infty)} = p_{\alpha=1} = p_{0,L}''$.

3 APPLICATIONS: IMPROVED DESCRIPTIONS OF A FEW PROBLEM CLASSES

This section strengthens the description of a few classical classes of functions or operators. For all of them, we perform a single round of the refinement procedure described in Section 2.1. We propose several reformulations/relaxations of these one-point strengthenings and show that the corresponding refined descriptions are strictly stronger than the classical descriptions serving as starting points.

A particularly common scenario is that of initial properties that are linear in the function values and the Gram matrix of the point and subgradient (or operator) values. That is, properties that are linear in f_i 's as well as linear in terms of $\langle g_i, x_i \rangle$, $\|g_i\|^2$, $\|x_i\|^2$ (or t_i instead of g_i for operators). In this case, we show that the resulting strengthening can be expressed as requiring non-negativity of a degree $2k$ polynomial (for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$), whose coefficients are linear in f_i 's and the Gram matrix.

Proposition 3.1. *Given $S = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket N \rrbracket}$, let p be a linear constraint in f_i 's and in the Gram matrix of x_i 's, g_i 's, i.e., that can be expressed as a set of conditions*

$$\sum_i \alpha_i^{(k)} f_i + \sum_i \sum_j \left(\beta_{ij}^{(k)} \langle g_i, g_j \rangle + \delta_{ij}^{(k)} \langle g_i, x_j \rangle + \eta_{ij}^{(k)} \langle x_i, x_j \rangle \right) \leq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

In addition, let (i) either all conditions in p be linear in g_i 's, i.e., all $\beta_{ii}^{(k)} = 0$, or at least one of them be strictly convex in g_i 's, i.e., at least one $\beta_{ii}^{(k)} > 0$, (ii) all conditions be concave in x_i 's, i.e., all $\eta_{ii}^{(k)} \leq 0$, (iii) all conditions in p be invariant under translation of f_i , i.e., $\forall k$, $\sum_i \alpha_i^{(k)} = 0$, and (iv) the inner problem in $\tilde{p}_{N, \mathbb{R}^d}(S)$, the one-point strengthening of p as described in (2.2) possess strong duality. Then, for some $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and some n -dimensional polynomial of degree $2k$: $P(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}_{2k}[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n]$, it holds

$$(3.1) \quad \tilde{p}_{N, \mathbb{R}^d}(S) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow P(\theta) \geq 0, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Similarly, given $S = \{(x_i, t_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket N \rrbracket}$, let p be a linear constraint in the Gram matrix of x_i 's, t_i 's, and such that (i) either all conditions in p are linear in t_i 's, or at least one of them is strictly convex in t_i 's, (ii) all conditions in p are concave in x_i 's, and (iii) the inner problem in $\tilde{p}_{N, \mathbb{R}^d}(S)$ possesses strong duality. Then, for some $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and some n -dimensional polynomial of degree $2k$: $P(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}_{2k}[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n]$, it holds

$$(3.2) \quad \tilde{p}_{N, \mathbb{R}^d}(S) \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow P(\theta) \geq 0, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is deferred to Appendix B.

While the set of non-negative polynomials is generally intractable, it can be approximated, e.g., by constraining the polynomial to lie within the set of SOS polynomials [27, 34, 37], which can be expressed as an SDP, linear in f_i 's and Gram matrix, see Section 1.1 for details. In particular, for one-dimensional polynomials, or two-dimensional polynomials when $k = 2$, SOS-polynomials and non-negative polynomials are strictly equivalent. Table 1 summarizes these applications of the refinement procedure.

Class	Section	Proposed formulations/relaxations of the one-point strengthening
Smooth functions satisfying a Łojasiewicz condition	3.1	(3.3): Pairwise linear inequalities, involving maximization over a single variable in \mathbb{R}^d , (3.4): SDP exact reformulation of (3.3).
Convex blockwise smooth functions	3.2	(3.5): Pairwise linear inequalities, involving maximization over a single variable in \mathbb{R}^d , (3.6): SDP exact reformulation of (3.5), (3.7): Terwise quadratic inequalities, involving a <i>if</i> condition.
Lipschitz strongly monotone operators	3.3	(3.8): Terwise linear inequalities, involving maximization over 3 variables in \mathbb{R}^d , (3.9): SDP relaxation of (3.8).
Strongly monotone cocoercive operators	F	(F.1): Terwise linear inequalities, involving maximization over 3 variables in \mathbb{R}^d , (F.2): SDP relaxation of (F.1).
Uniformly convex functions	G	(G.3): Terwise convex inequalities, involving maximization over a single variable in \mathbb{R}^d .
Smooth convex functions on convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^d	H	Pairwise linear inequalities.

Table 1: Summary: function and operator classes studied within this work, along with the nature of the strengthened conditions as expressions of the function values and Gram matrix (of (x_i, g_i) or (x_i, t_i)).

3.1 EXTENSION OF SMOOTH FUNCTIONS SATISFYING A ŁOJASIEWICZ CONDITION

This section studies the class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{L},L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of L -smooth functions f satisfying a quadratic Łojasiewicz condition, that is satisfying, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ [2, 9, 10, 35],

($p_{\mathbb{L},L}$)

$$p_{\mathbb{L},L}^{xy} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} f(x) \leq f_{\star} + \frac{\|\nabla f(x)\|^2}{2\mu} \\ f(x) \geq f_{\star} \\ f(x) \geq f(y) + \frac{1}{2}\langle \nabla f(x) + \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{1}{4L}\|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2 - \frac{L}{4}\|x - y\|^2, \end{cases}$$

where $f_{\star} = \min_x f(x)$ is guaranteed to exist and $0 \leq \mu \leq L$. The last condition imposes smoothness of the function, equivalently to $\|f(x) - f(y) - \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle\| \leq \frac{L}{2}\|x - y\|^2$ [51, Theorem 4].

Exploiting the iterative refinement technique, $p_{L,\mu,L}$ can be strengthened as follows.

Proposition 3.2. Consider $Q = \{(x_1, x_2, x_\star)\}$, and $(p_{L,\mu,L})$. Then, $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$, the pairwise one-point strengthening of $p_{L,\mu,L}$ with respect to \mathbb{R}^d , is satisfied only if

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}^{ij} \leq 0 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} f_i \leq f_\star + \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2\mu} \\ f_i \geq f_\star + \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L} \\ f_i \geq f_j + \frac{1}{2}\langle g_i + g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4L}\|g_i - g_j\|^2 - \frac{L}{4}\|x_i - x_j\|^2 \\ \quad + \max_{0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}} \frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)(2\mu-(L+\mu)\alpha)} \left((1-\alpha)^2(L+\mu)(f_i - f_\star - \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L}) - (L-\mu)(f_j - f_\star + \frac{\|g_j\|^2}{2L}) \right). \end{cases}$$

The detailed proof of Proposition 3.2 is deferred to Appendix C.1. It consists in (i) formulating the pairwise one-point strengthening (2.2) of $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$, (ii) dualizing the inner problem (minimization over $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_z \in \mathbb{R}$, $g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d$) in this one-point strengthening as to relax it into a maximization problem over positive dual variables and $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, (iii) explicitly maximizing this relaxation in z , and (iv) computing several feasible solutions to this relaxation, by setting some dual variables to 0 and either explicitly maximize over the remaining variables (e.g., to obtain $f_i \geq f_\star + \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L}$), or obtain a constraint involving one of the remaining variables (e.g., α in the last condition in (3.3)).

Remark 3.3. Setting $\alpha = 0$ in the last condition in (3.3) allows recovering the last condition in $p_{L,\mu,L}$, hence these conditions, although relaxations of $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$, are indeed at least as strong as $p_{L,\mu,L}$. The example illustrated in Figure 2 allows concluding (3.3) is strictly stronger than $p_{L,\mu,L}$.

In principle, one could obtain a closed form expression for the last condition in (3.3), by solving the associated maximization problem and obtaining an optimal α_\star , function of $\{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i=1,2,\star}$. However, seeking a formulation that involves only linear expressions in f_i 's as well as in the Gram matrix of g_i 's, x_i 's, we propose instead an SDP reformulation of (3.3).

Proposition 3.4. Consider a pair $S = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i=1,2}$. It holds that S satisfies (3.3) if and only (i) $f_i \leq f_\star + \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2\mu}$, $i = 1, 2$, (ii) $f_i \geq f_\star + \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L}$, $i = 1, 2$, and (iii) $\forall i, j = 1, 2$, there exists some

$$(3.4) \quad M^{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{12} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0, \quad \bar{M}^{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} -A(2L+\mu) & \bar{M}_{12} \\ \bar{M}_{12} & \bar{M}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0,$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{11} - \bar{M}_{11} + \frac{4\mu}{2L+\mu}\bar{M}_{12} &= -(B - C - (L+3\mu)A), \\ 2M_{12} - 2\bar{M}_{12} + \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}\bar{M}_{22} &= -(L+\mu)A + 2B, \\ M_{22} - \bar{M}_{22} &= -B, \end{aligned}$$

where $A = (-f_i + f_j + \frac{1}{2}\langle g_i + g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4L}\|g_i - g_j\|^2 - \frac{L}{4}\|x_i - x_j\|^2)$, $B = (L+\mu)(f_i - f_\star - \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L})$, and $C = (L-\mu)(f_j - f_\star + \frac{\|g_j\|^2}{2L})$.

The detailed proof of Proposition 3.4 is deferred to Appendix C.2, and relies on Markov-Lukacs theorem, see, e.g., [49, Theorem 1.21].

While (3.4) is an exact reformulation of (3.3), it remains a relaxation of $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$ since (3.3) is itself a relaxation of this one-point strengthening.

Figure 2 illustrates, on a numerical example, the difference in datasets satisfying $p_{L,\mu,L}$ as compared to (3.3), the relaxation of $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$. Observe that in this context of simply verifying whether or not a dataset satisfies (3.3), one can directly solve the maximization problem in (3.3).




Figure 2: Allowed regions for f_2 as a function of g_2 , according to (3.3) and $p_{L_{\mu,L}}$ given $\mu = 1/2$, $L = 1$, $(x_\star, f_\star, g_\star) = (0, 0, 0)$, $(x_1, f_1, g_1) = (1, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $x_2 = \frac{3}{8}$.

Alternatively, if one aims for conditions that share the same structure as $p_{L_{\mu,L}}$, one can relax (3.3) by imposing the last condition for k specific values of α . This could allow strengthening $(p_{L_{\mu,L}})$ by conducting a second one-point iteration, starting from this relaxation, see Remark 2.7.

3.2 CONVEX BLOCKWISE SMOOTH FUNCTIONS

This section studies the class $\mathcal{F}_{0,\mathbb{L}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of convex blockwise \mathbb{L} -smooth functions f , that is functions satisfying, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ [40],

$$(p_{0,\mathbb{L}}) \quad p_{0,\mathbb{L}}^{xy} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow f(x) \geq f(y) + \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_i} \|\nabla_i f(x) - \nabla_i f(y)\|^2, \quad \forall i \in \llbracket n \rrbracket,$$

where $n \in \llbracket d \rrbracket$ and $\nabla_i f$ denotes the i^{th} block-component of the gradient of f .

It is known that this condition is a pairwise interpolation condition on \mathbb{R}^d , but no K -wise interpolation conditions for $K \geq 3$.

Example 3.5 (Counterexample to sufficiency of $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ [29]). Let $n = d = 2$, $L_1 = L_2 = 1$, and $S = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket}$, where $(x_1, f_1, g_1) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \frac{1}{2}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, $(x_2, f_2, g_2) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \frac{1}{2}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, and $(x_3, f_3, g_3) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, 0, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}\right)$. Then S satisfies $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ while not consistent with a function in $\mathcal{F}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$.

Exploiting the one-point refinement technique, we strengthen $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ on sets of cardinality 3 as follows.

Proposition 3.6. Let $Q = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3)\}$, and $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$. Then, $\tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$, the terwise one-point strengthening of $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ with respect to \mathbb{R}^d , is satisfied only if

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}^{ijk} \leq 0 \Rightarrow 0 \geq & (1 - \lambda) \left(-f_i + f_j + \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_i^{(m)} - g_j^{(m)}\|^2 \right) \\ & + \lambda \left(-f_i + f_k + \langle g_k, x_i - x_k \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_i^{(m)} - g_k^{(m)}\|^2 \right) \\ & + \lambda(1 - \lambda) \left(\max_l \frac{1}{2L_l} \|g_j^{(l)} - g_k^{(l)}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_j^{(m)} - g_k^{(m)}\|^2 \right), \quad \forall m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, \quad \forall \lambda \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

where $g_i^{(m)}$ denotes the m^{th} component of g_i .

The detailed proof of Proposition 3.6 is deferred to Appendix D.1. It consists in (i) formulating the pairwise one-point strengthening (2.2) of $\tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$, (ii) dualizing the inner problem in this one-point

strengthening as to relax it into a maximization problem over positive dual variables and $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, (iii) explicitly maximizing this relaxation in z , and (iv) computing a feasible solution to this relaxation, by setting some dual variables to 0 and obtaining a constraint involving one of the remaining variables, that is $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Observe that the max over l can be easily dealt with by simply imposing (3.5) to be true for every l .

Remark 3.7. Observe that the counterexample 3.5 is discarded by (3.5) with $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$.

Remark 3.8. Setting $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$ in (3.5) allows recovering $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$, hence again this relaxation of $\tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ is at least as strong as $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$. Remark 3.7 allows concluding that (3.5) is actually strictly stronger than $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$.

Similarly to Section 3.1, seeking a formulation that involves only linear expressions in f_i 's as well as in the Gram matrix of g_i 's, x_i 's, we propose a reformulation of (3.5) as an SDP.

Proposition 3.9. *Consider a triplet $S = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket}$. It holds that S satisfies (3.5) if and only if $\forall m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $\forall i, j, k \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket$, there exists some*

$$(3.6) \quad M_m^{ijk} = \begin{bmatrix} -A_{ijm} & M_{12} \\ M_{12} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0, \quad K_m^{ijk} \geq 0,$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} 2M_{m,12}^{ijk} + K_m^{ijk} &= A_{ijm} - A_{ikm} - B_{jkm}, \\ M_{m,22}^{ijk} - K_m^{ijk} &= B_{jkm}, \end{aligned}$$

where $A_{ijm} = -f_i + f_j + \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_i^{(m)} - g_j^{(m)}\|^2$,
and $B_{jkm} = \max_l \frac{1}{2L_l} \|g_j^{(l)} - g_k^{(l)}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_j^{(m)} - g_k^{(m)}\|^2$.

The detailed proof of Proposition 3.9 is deferred to Appendix D.2, and relies on Markov-Lukacs theorem, see, e.g., [49, Theorem 1.21].

While (3.6) is an exact reformulation of (3.5), it remains a relaxation of $\tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ since (3.5) is itself a relaxation of this one-point strengthening.

Alternatively, optimizing (3.5) in λ straightforwardly allows obtaining a closed-form for this condition.

Proposition 3.10. *With the same notation as in Proposition 3.9 and considering a triplet $S = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket}$, it holds that S satisfies (3.5) if and only if $\forall m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ and $\forall i, j, k \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket$,*

$$(3.7) \quad A_{ikm} \leq 0 \quad (A_{ijm} - A_{ikm})^2 + B_{jkm}^2 + 2B_{jkm}(A_{ijm} + A_{ikm}) \leq 0 \text{ if } \frac{A_{ikm} - A_{ijm} + B_{jkm}}{2B_{jkm}} \in [0, 1].$$

Proof. Note that (3.5) is quadratic in λ , and possesses a maximum in $\lambda_\star = \frac{A_{ikm} - A_{ijm} + B_{jkm}}{2B_{jkm}}$. When $\lambda_\star \in [0, 1]$, (3.5) is thus maximized in λ_\star and its maximum is given by (3.7). Otherwise, (3.5) is maximized in $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = 1$, leading to $A_{ikm}, A_{ijm} \leq 0$. \square

We illustrate in Figure 3 on a numerical example the difference in datasets satisfying $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ as compared to (3.5), the relaxation of $\tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$.

Similarly to Section 3.1, one can obtain conditions that share exactly the same structure as $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ by imposing (3.5) for k specific values of λ , which could provide a starting point for a second iteration of the refinement procedure, see Remark 2.7.




Figure 3: Allowed regions for f_3 as a function of h_3 , according to (3.5) and $p_{0,L}$, given $L_x = L_y = 1$, $(x_1, f_1, g_1) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, $(x_2, f_2, g_2) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, $x_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $g_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g_3^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$.

3.3 STRONGLY MONOTONE LIPSCHITZ OPERATORS

This section studies the class $\mathcal{Q}_{\mu,L}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of maximally monotone Lipschitz operators, that is operators T satisfying, for some $0 \leq \mu \leq L$, and $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ [7, 48],

$$(q_{\mu,L}) \quad q_{\mu,L}^{xy} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} -\langle T(x) - T(y), x - y \rangle + \mu \|x - y\|^2 \leq 0 \\ \|T(x) - T(y)\| - L \|x - y\| \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

To prevent any confusion with properties related to function classes, we use the notation q instead of p to denote a property.

It is known [48, Proposition 4] that $q_{\mu,L}$ is a pairwise interpolation condition on \mathbb{R}^d , and a global interpolation condition when $d = 1$. However, when $K \geq 3$ or $d \geq 2$, $q_{\mu,L}$ is no longer a K -wise interpolation condition and is only necessary.

Example 3.11 (Counterexample to sufficiency of $q_{\mu,L}$ [48]). Let $d = 2$, $\mu = 0$, $L = 1$, and $S = \{(x_i, t_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket}$, where $(x_1, t_1) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, $(x_2, t_2) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, $(x_3, t_3) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1/2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1/2 \end{pmatrix}\right)$. Then S satisfies $q_{\mu,L}$ while not consistent with a function in $\mathcal{Q}_{\mu,L}$.

The refinement procedure described in Section 2.1 allows strengthening $q_{\mu,L}$, starting with a set of cardinality 3.

Proposition 3.12. Consider $Q = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3)\}$, and $q_{\mu,L}$. Then, $\tilde{q}_{\mu,L}$, the terwise one-point strengthening of $q_{\mu,L}$ with respect to \mathbb{R}^d , is satisfied only if

$$(3.8) \quad \tilde{q}_{\mu,L}^{ijk} \leq 0 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \forall \lambda_k, \mu_i, \mu_j \geq 0 : \\ 0 \geq \lambda_k(\mu_i + \mu_j)(A_{ik}\mu_i + A_{jk}\mu_j) - \lambda_k\mu_i\mu_j A_{ij} + \lambda_k^2(B_{ik}\mu_i + B_{jk}\mu_j) + B_{ij}\mu_i\mu_j(\mu_i + \mu_j - 2\mu\lambda_k) \\ 0 \geq \lambda_k(\mu_i + \mu_j)(B_{ik}\mu_i + B_{jk}\mu_j) - \lambda_k\mu_i\mu_j B_{ij} + \lambda_k^2(A_{ik}\mu_i + A_{jk}\mu_j) + A_{ij}\mu_i\mu_j(\mu_i + \mu_j - 2\mu\lambda_k), \end{cases}$$

where $A_{ij} = \|t_i - t_j\|^2 - L^2\|x_i - x_j\|^2$ and $B_{ij} = -2L\langle t_i - t_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + 2L\mu\|x_i - x_j\|^2$.

The detailed proof of Proposition 3.12 is deferred to Appendix E.1. It consists in (i) formulating the pairwise one-point strengthening (2.2) of $\tilde{q}_{\mu,L}$, (ii) dualizing the inner problem in this one-point strengthening as to relax it into a maximization problem over positive dual variables and $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, (iii) explicitly maximizing this relaxation in z , and (iv) computing a feasible solution to this relaxation, by setting some dual variables to 0 and obtaining a constraint involving the remaining variables, i.e., λ_k, μ_i and μ_j .

Remark 3.13. Observe that the counterexample 3.11 does not satisfy (3.8), and separates $\mathcal{F}_{q_{\mu,L}}(Q)$ from $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{q}_{\mu,L}}(Q)$.

Remark 3.14. Setting $\lambda_k = 0$ in (3.8) allows recovering $q_{\mu,L}$, hence again this relaxation of $\tilde{q}_{\mu,L}$ is at least as strong as $q_{\mu,L}$. Remark 3.13 allows concluding (3.8) is actually strictly stronger than $q_{\mu,L}$.

Similarly to Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we propose a relaxation of (3.8) as an SDP.

Proposition 3.15. *With the same notation as in Proposition 3.12 and considering a triplet $S = \{(x_i, t_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket}$, it holds that S satisfies (3.8) if $\forall i, j, k \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket$, there exists some $M_{A,B}^{ijk} \succcurlyeq 0$, $M_{B,A}^{ijk} \succcurlyeq 0$, where*

$$(3.9) \quad M_{\alpha,\beta}^{ijk} = \begin{bmatrix} -\beta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & M_{14} & M_{15} & M_{16} & M_{17} \\ 0 & -\alpha_{jk} & -M_{15} & 0 & -M_{14} & M_{26} & M_{27} \\ 0 & -M_{15} & -\beta_{ij} & M_{34} & -M_{16} & 0 & M_{37} \\ M_{14} & 0 & M_{34} & -\beta_{jk} & -M_{27} & M_{46} & 0 \\ M_{15} & -M_{14} & -M_{16} & -M_{27} & M_{55} & -M_{37} & -M_{46} \\ M_{16} & M_{26} & 0 & M_{46} & -M_{37} & -\alpha_{ik} & 0 \\ M_{17} & M_{27} & M_{37} & 0 & -M_{46} & 0 & -\beta_{ik} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$M_{55} + 2M_{17} + 2M_{26} + 2M_{34} = \alpha_{ij} + 2\mu\beta_{ij} - \alpha_{jk} - \alpha_{ik}.$$

The detailed proof of Proposition 3.15 is deferred to Appendix E.2.

We illustrate in Figure 4 on a numerical example the difference in datasets satisfying $q_{\mu,L}$ as compared to (3.8), the relaxation of $\tilde{q}_{0,L}$.




Figure 4: Allowed regions for t_3 , according to $q_{\mu,L}$ or (3.8), given $\mu = 0$, $L = 1$, $(x_1, t_1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $(x_2, t_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{0}{-1/2})$, and $x_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 \end{pmatrix}$.

4 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This work presents a one-point strengthening method, that can be seen as a principled and constructive approach to interpolation/extension conditions. The approach starts from any characterization of a class of functions/operators and constructs a refined characterization of this class. Repeating the procedure iteratively allows obtaining extension conditions as a final product. In particular, it allows for strengthening given sets of conditions based only on their algebraic properties, leading to improved conditions that would have been challenging to guess based solely on the class' analytical properties.

In addition, starting from linear conditions in function values and Gram representation of points and subgradients (or operator values) yields refined conditions that are SDP-representable and can be used as such when imposed on datasets that are variable to some optimization problem.

The approach naturally showcases some limitations and raises open questions. First, our main technical tools for computing one-point strengthening consist of dualizing the inner problem in (2.2). Hence, the approach fails as soon as the initial property under consideration is not convex in F_z . Similarly, the approach is naturally limited to properties for which this dualization yields a zero duality gap. In other cases, the approach might attain only a very loose strengthening. Furthermore, we generally have to work with closed-form solutions to this inner problem, and we are thereby quickly limited to having to deal with reasonably simple expressions. Indeed, we quickly arrive at formulations that turn out to be hardly manipulable, both for computing their one-point strengthening and for proving their stability.

The many remaining open challenges thus include the questions of tackling conditions whose one-point strengthenings are not convex in F_z . Another venue for improvement is that of specializing the approach to more specific classes of problems (e.g., smooth functions that are defined on specific sets instead of smooth functions with general convex domains; see Appendix H). Yet another possible improvement could be to search for one-point strengthenings without relaxations, for instance, by relying on quantifier elimination techniques (see, e.g., [6])—that do not scale well in the number of variables and parameters in general, but that could handle our problems with very few of them.

Codes. Codes for reproducing and verifying technical parts of this work can be found at

https://github.com/AnneRubbens/Constraints_Strengthening

As this work is strongly motivated by algorithm analyses—it was recently shown that interpolation/extension conditions are key for systematically analyzing their performance; see, e.g., [52] or recent presentations [21, 46]—, we provide a few examples of such applications using the conditions obtained in Section 3. These include analysis of the gradient method on smooth function satisfying a Łojasiewicz condition [11, 2, 30] (see Section 3.1), of the random or cyclic coordinate descent on convex blockwise smooth functions [1, 8, 29, 40] (see Section 3.2), and of the optimistic gradient and extragradient on Lipschitz monotone operators [20, 19, 32] (see Section 3.3). In addition, the SDP formulations (3.4), (3.6) and (3.9) of the improved descriptions of (i) smooth functions satisfying a Łojasiewicz condition, (ii) blockwise smooth convex functions, and (iii) (strongly) monotone Lipschitz operators, have been added to the PEPit Python library [PEPit documentation](#) [22], which allows solving PEPs on these classes straightforwardly.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The authors would like to thank François Glineur for insightful feedback. A. Rubbens is supported by a FNRS fellowship. J. Hendrickx is supported by the SIDDARTA Concerted Research Action (ARC) of the Federation Wallonie-Bruxelles. A. Taylor is supported by the European Union (ERC grant CASPER 101162889). The French government also partly funded this work under the management of Agence Nationale de la Recherche as part of the “France 2030” program, reference ANR-23-IACL-0008 (PR[AI]RIE-PSAI). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Abbaszadehpeivasti, E. de Klerk, and M. Zamani, Convergence rate analysis of randomized and cyclic coordinate descent for convex optimization through semidefinite programming, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.12384* (2022).

- [2] H. Abbaszadehpeivasti, E. de Klerk, and M. Zamani, Conditions for linear convergence of the gradient method for non-convex optimization, *Optimization Letters* 17 (2023), 1105–1125.
- [3] D. Azagra and C. Mudarra, An Extension Theorem for convex functions of class $C^{1,1}$ on Hilbert spaces, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 446 (2017), 1167–1182.
- [4] D. Azagra and C. Mudarra, Whitney extension theorems for convex functions of the classes C^1 and $C^{1,\omega}$, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 114 (2017), 133–158.
- [5] D. Azagra and C. Mudarra, Smooth convex extensions of convex functions, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 58 (2019), 1–27.
- [6] S. Basu, R. M. Pollack, and M. F. Roy, *Algorithms in Real Algebraic Geometry*, volume 10 of Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [7] H. H. Bauschke, P. L. Combettes, H. H. Bauschke, and P. L. Combettes, *Correction to: convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*, Springer, 2017.
- [8] A. Beck and L. Tetruashvili, On the Convergence of Block Coordinate Descent Type Methods, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 23 (2013), 2037–2060.
- [9] J. Bolte, A. Daniilidis, and A. Lewis, The Łojasiewicz inequality for nonsmooth subanalytic functions with applications to subgradient dynamical systems, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 17 (2007), 1205–1223.
- [10] J. Bolte, A. Daniilidis, O. Ley, and L. Mazet, Characterizations of Łojasiewicz inequalities: subgradient flows, talweg, convexity, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 362 (2010), 3319–3363.
- [11] J. Bolte, T. P. Nguyen, J. Peypouquet, and B. W. Suter, From error bounds to the complexity of first-order descent methods for convex functions, *Mathematical Programming* 165 (2017), 471–507.
- [12] N. Bousselmi, J. M. Hendrickx, and F. Glineur, Interpolation conditions for linear operators and applications to performance estimation problems, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 34 (2024), 3033–3063.
- [13] A. Daniilidis, M. Haddou, E. Le Gruyer, and O. Ley, Explicit formulas for $C^{1,1}$ Glaeser-Whitney extensions of 1-Taylor fields in Hilbert spaces, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 146 (2018), 4487–4495.
- [14] R. A. Dragomir, A. B. Taylor, A. d’Aspremont, and J. Bolte, Optimal complexity and certification of Bregman first-order methods, *Mathematical Programming* 194 (2022), 41–83.
- [15] Y. Drori, On the Properties of Convex Functions over Open Sets, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 27 (2020), 1303–1314.
- [16] Y. Drori and M. Teboulle, Performance of first-order methods for smooth convex minimization: a novel approach, *Mathematical Programming* 145 (2014), 451–482.
- [17] M. Dür, Copositive programming—a survey, in *Recent Advances in Optimization and its Applications in Engineering: The 14th Belgian-French-German Conference on Optimization*, Springer, 2010, 3–20.
- [18] C. Fefferman, A. Israel, and G. K. Luli, Interpolation of data by smooth nonnegative functions, *Revista matemática iberoamericana* 33 (2017), 305–324.

- [19] E. Gorbunov, N. Loizou, and G. Gidel, Extragradient method: $O(1/k)$ last-iterate convergence for monotone variational inequalities and connections with cocoercivity, in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, PMLR, 2022, 366–402.
- [20] E. Gorbunov, A. Taylor, and G. Gidel, Last-iterate convergence of optimistic gradient method for monotone variational inequalities, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* (2022).
- [21] B. Goujaud, A. Dieuleveut, and A. Taylor, On fundamental proof structures in first-order optimization, in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2023, 3023–3030.
- [22] B. Goujaud, C. Moucer, F. Glineur, J. M. Hendrickx, A. B. Taylor, and A. Dieuleveut, PEPit: computer-assisted worst-case analyses of first-order optimization methods in Python, *Mathematical Programming Computation* 16 (2024), 337–367.
- [23] B. Goujaud, A. Taylor, and A. Dieuleveut, Optimal first-order methods for convex functions with a quadratic upper bound, *preprint arXiv:2205.15033* (2022).
- [24] E. L. Gruyer, Minimal Lipschitz extensions to differentiable functions defined on a Hilbert space, *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 19 (2009), 1101–1118.
- [25] C. Guille-Escuret, A. Ibrahim, B. Goujaud, and I. Mitliagkas, Gradient descent is optimal under lower restricted secant inequality and upper error bound, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* (2022).
- [26] L. A. Hannah and D. B. Dunson, Multivariate convex regression with adaptive partitioning, *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 14 (2013), 3261–3294.
- [27] D. Hilbert, Über die darstellung definiter formen als summe von formenquadraten, *Mathematische Annalen* 32 (1888), 342–350.
- [28] A. Juditski and Y. Nesterov, Primal-dual subgradient methods for minimizing uniformly convex functions, *preprint arXiv:1401.1792* (2014).
- [29] Y. Kamri, J. M. Hendrickx, and F. Glineur, On the worst-case analysis of cyclic coordinate-wise algorithms on smooth convex functions, in *2023 European Control Conference (ECC)*, IEEE, 2023, 1–8.
- [30] H. Karimi, J. Nutini, and M. Schmidt, Linear convergence of gradient and proximal-gradient methods under the polyak-łojasiewicz condition, in *Joint European conference on machine learning and knowledge discovery in databases*, Springer, 2016, 795–811.
- [31] M. Kirszbraun, Über die zusammenziehende und Lipschitzsche Transformationen, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 22 (1934), 77–108.
- [32] G. M. Korpelevich, The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems, *Matecon* 12 (1976), 747–756.
- [33] D. Lambert, J. P. Crouzeix, V. H. Nguyen, and J. J. Strodiot, Finite convex integration, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 11 (2004), 131–146.
- [34] J. B. Lasserre, *Moments, positive polynomials and their applications*, volume 1, World Scientific, 2009.

- [35] S. Łojasiewicz, Une propriété topologique des sous-ensembles analytiques réels, *Les équations aux dérivées partielles* 117 (1963), 87–89.
- [36] A. Luner and B. Grimmer, Performance Estimation for Smooth and Strongly Convex Sets, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.14811* (2024).
- [37] M. Marshall, *Positive Polynomials and Sums of Squares*, volume 146 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [38] J.E. Maxfield and H. Minc, On the matrix equation $X'X = A$, *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society* 13 (1962), 125–129.
- [39] T.S. Motzkin, Copositive quadratic forms, *National Bureau of Standards Report* 1818 (1952), 11–12.
- [40] Y. Nesterov, Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 22 (2012), 341–362.
- [41] Y. Nesterov, Universal gradient methods for convex optimization problems, *Mathematical Programming* 152 (2015), 381–404.
- [42] Y. Nesterov, *Lectures on convex optimization*, volume 137, Springer, 2018.
- [43] F.P. Paty, A. d’Aspremont, and M. Cuturi, Regularity as regularization: Smooth and strongly convex brenier potentials in optimal transport, in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, PMLR, 2020, 1222–1232.
- [44] B.T. Polyak, Gradient methods for the minimisation of functionals, *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* 3 (1963), 864–878.
- [45] R.T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*, volume 28, Princeton university press, 1997.
- [46] A. Rubbens, N. Bousselmi, S. Colla, and J.M. Hendrickx, Interpolation constraints for computing worst-case bounds in performance estimation problems, in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, IEEE, 2023, 3015–3022.
- [47] A. Rubbens and J.M. Hendrickx, A constraint-based approach to function interpolation, with application to performance estimation for weakly convex optimisation, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.08405>.
- [48] E.K. Ryu, A.B. Taylor, C. Bergeling, and P. Giselsson, Operator splitting performance estimation: Tight contraction factors and optimal parameter selection, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 30 (2020), 2251–2271.
- [49] G. Szeg, *Orthogonal polynomials*, volume 23, American Mathematical Soc., 1939.
- [50] A.B. Taylor, *Convex interpolation and performance estimation of first-order methods for convex optimization.*, PhD thesis, Catholic University of Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, 2017.
- [51] A.B. Taylor, J.M. Hendrickx, and F. Glineur, Exact worst-case performance of first-order methods for composite convex optimization, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 27 (2017), 1283–1313.
- [52] A.B. Taylor, J.M. Hendrickx, and F. Glineur, Smooth strongly convex interpolation and exact worst-case performance of first-order methods, *Mathematical Programming* 161 (2017), 307–345.
- [53] F.A. Valentine, On the extension of a vector function so as to preserve a Lipschitz condition, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 49 (1943), 100–108.

- [54] H. Whitney, Differentiable functions defined in closed sets. I, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 36 (1934), 369–387.
- [55] M. Yan, Extension of Convex Function, *Journal of Convex Analysis* 21 (2014), 965–987.
- [56] C. Zălinescu, On uniformly convex functions, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 95 (1983), 344–374.

APPENDIX: Table of Contents

A	Showing stability of a condition on an example: Lipschitz operators	22
B	Proof of Proposition 3.1	23
C	Smooth functions satisfying a quadratic Łojasiewicz condition	25
C.1	Derivation of the one-point strengthening: proof of Proposition 3.2	25
C.2	Derivation of a SOS reformulation: proof of Proposition 3.4	26
D	Convex blockwise smooth functions	27
D.1	Derivation of the one-point strengthening: proof of Proposition 3.6	27
D.2	Derivation of a SOS reformulation: proof of Proposition 3.9	28
E	Strongly monotone Lipschitz operators	28
E.1	Derivation of the one-point strengthening: proof of Proposition 3.12	28
E.2	Derivation of a SOS reformulation: proof of Proposition 3.15	29
F	Strongly monotone cocoercive operators	29
F.1	Derivation of the one-point strengthening	30
F.2	Derivation of a SOS reformulation	31
G	Uniformly convex functions	31
H	Smooth convex functions with constrained convex domain	33

APPENDIX A SHOWING STABILITY OF A CONDITION ON AN EXAMPLE: LIPSCHITZ OPERATORS

Consider the class $\mathcal{Q}_{-L,L}$ of Lipschitz operators T , satisfying, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(q_{-L,L}) \quad q_{-L,L}^{xy} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \|T(x) - T(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|.$$

It is known [31, 53] that $q_{-L,L}$ is a global interpolation constraint for $\mathcal{Q}_{-L,L}$.

This section shows how to retrieve this result via the refinement procedure described in Section 2.1, by analyzing different formulations of the one-point strengthening of $q_{-L,L}$.

Consider $Q = \{(x_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket N \rrbracket}$. The N -wise strengthening of $q_{-L,L}$ with respect to \mathbb{R}^d is given by

$$\tilde{q}_{-L,L} = \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ t_z \in \mathbb{R}^d}} \tau \text{ s.t. } \|t_z - t_i\|^2 - L^2\|z - x_i\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i \in \llbracket N \rrbracket, \quad (\lambda_i)$$

where λ_i are the associated coefficients. Observe that this strengthening is convex in t_z and τ , and that $(t_z, \tau) = (0, \max_i \|t_i\|^2 + 1)$ satisfy Slater's condition, hence there is no duality gap for this inner problem. Dualization of the inner problem yields

$$\tilde{q}_{-L,L} = \max_{\substack{\lambda_i \geq 0, \\ \sum_i \lambda_i = 1}} \sum_i \lambda_i (\|t_z^* - t_i\|^2 - L^2 \|z - x_i\|^2) \text{ s.t. } t_z^* = \sum_i \lambda_i t_i \text{ and } x = \sum_i \lambda_i x_i,$$

where t_z^* minimizes the inner problem in $\tilde{q}_{-L,L}$. This condition is homogeneous of degree 2 in λ_i . Hence, for any $K \geq 0$, it must hold with $\tilde{\lambda}_i = K\lambda_i$ replacing λ_i , which allows removing the condition $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$.

The second derivative of $\tilde{q}_{-L,L}$ with respect to $\lambda_i \in \llbracket N \rrbracket$ is given by

$$(A.1) \quad H_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{q}_{-L,L}}{\partial \lambda_i \partial \lambda_j} = \begin{cases} \|t_i - t_j\|^2 - L^2 \|x_i - x_j\|^2, & i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Satisfaction of $\tilde{q}_{-L,L}$ is thus equivalent to requiring $-H$, whose elements are given by (A.1), to be co-positive, i.e.

$$x^T H x \preceq 0, \forall x \geq 0.$$

Equivalently, building on the elements of H , it holds

$$(A.2) \quad \tilde{q}_{-L,L} = \max_{\lambda_i \geq 0} \sum_{i,j \in \llbracket N \rrbracket, j > i} \lambda_j \lambda_i (\|t_i - t_j\|^2 - L^2 \|x_i - x_j\|^2).$$

Necessarily, for $\tilde{q}_{-L,L}$ to be negative, it must hold $\|t_i - t_j\|^2 - L^2 \|x_i - x_j\|^2 \leq 0, i, j \in \llbracket N \rrbracket$. In addition, if this condition is satisfied, then $\tilde{q}_{-L,L} \leq 0$. Hence, $\tilde{q}_{-L,L} = q_{-L,L}$.

APPENDIX B PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

Proof. Clearly, if p consists of inequalities that only involve a single point, or if $N = 1, \tilde{p} = p$. Hence, we suppose $N \geq 2$ and p involves more than one point.

Consider first the case of function classes. The N -wise one-point strengthening of p on \mathbb{R}^d as defined in (2.2) is satisfied if and only if for some A_m linear in the Gram matrix of x_i 's, g_i 's and in f_i 's, D_m and F_m linear in x_i 's, g_i 's, and B_m, C_m, E_m, G_m scalar values,

$$0 \geq \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \tau \in \mathbb{R} \\ g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ f_z \in \mathbb{R}}} \min \tau \quad \text{s.t. } A_m + B_m f_z + C_m \|g_z\|^2 + \langle D_m, g_z \rangle + E_m \langle g_z, z \rangle + \langle F_m, z \rangle + G_m \|z\|^2 \leq 0, m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket \quad (\lambda_m)$$

where M is determined by the number of inequalities in p , the number of points they involve, and N . For instance, if p is expressed as a single inequality involving 2 points and $N = 2$, then $M = 4$. Hence, $M \geq 4$.

Suppose first there exists at least one $C_m \neq 0$. Since the inner problem possesses strong duality, dualization of the inner problem implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} &= \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ \lambda_m \geq 0}} \sum_m \left(\lambda_m A_m + \lambda_m \langle F_m, z \rangle + \lambda_m G_m \|z\|^2 \right) - \frac{\| \sum_m \lambda_m (E_m z + D_m) \|^2}{4 \sum_m \lambda_m C_m} \\ \text{s.t. Dualization over } \tau : & \sum_m \lambda_m = 1 \\ \text{Dualization over } f_z : & \sum_m \lambda_m B_m = 0 \\ \text{Dualization over } g_z : & \sum_m \lambda_m C_m > 0. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality ensures that the inner problem is minimized in g_z . The constraints are always feasible due to the strict convexity in g_i 's, the invariance under translation in f_i 's and the fact that p is enforced for all tuples, i.e., $\sum_m B_m = 0$. Multiplying by $4 \sum_m \lambda_m C_m$ and maximizing over z yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} = \max_{\lambda_m \geq 0} & 4 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m A_l - \left\| \sum_m \lambda_m D_m \right\|^2 + \frac{\|4 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m F_l - 2 \sum_m \sum_l E_m D_l\|^2}{4(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m)^2 - 16 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m G_l} \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_m \lambda_m = 1, \sum_m \lambda_m B_m = 0, \sum_m \lambda_m C_m > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m)^2 > 4 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m G_l$ by concavity of p in x_i 's, ensuring the objective function was indeed maximized in z . Multiplying by $4(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m)^2 - 16 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m G_l$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} = \max_{\lambda_m \geq 0} & \left(4(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m)^2 - 16 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m G_l \right) \left(4 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m A_l - \left\| \sum_m \lambda_m D_m \right\|^2 \right) \\ & + \|4 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m F_l - 2 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l E_m D_l\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_m \lambda_m = 1, \sum_m \lambda_m B_m = 0, \sum_m \lambda_m C_m > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This condition is homogeneous of degree 4 in $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$. Hence, for any $K \geq 0$, \tilde{p} is satisfied if and only if it must hold with $\tilde{\lambda}_m = K\lambda_m$, which allows removing the constraint $\sum_m \lambda_m = 1$. Replacing the maximization over λ_m by requiring the objective function to be non-positive for all feasible values of λ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \lambda_m : \lambda_m \geq 0, \sum_m \lambda_m B_m = 0, \sum_m \lambda_m C_m > 0, \\ \tilde{p} = & \left(4(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m)^2 - 16 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m G_l \right) \left(4 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m A_l - \left\| \sum_m \lambda_m D_m \right\|^2 \right) \\ & + \|4 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l C_m F_l - 2 \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l E_m D_l\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

The one-point strengthening of p is thus be satisfied if and only if a given polynomial of degree 4 in λ , is non-positive on a given domain. The coefficients of the polynomial are all scalar products multiplying either A_m , $\|D_m\|^2$, $\|F_m\|^2$, $\|D_m\|^2$ or $\langle F_m, D_l \rangle$, hence they are linear in function values and Gram matrix. It thus remains to translate requiring a polynomial to be non-positive on a given domain to another polynomial to be non-positive on the whole domain.

If all conditions on λ_m except for its positivity are naturally satisfied, e.g., because all $C_m \geq 0$ and all $B_m = 0$, it suffices to set $\lambda_m = \theta_m^2, \forall m$, to obtain a polynomial of degree 8 in θ , that should be non-positive everywhere. Else, the equality constraint $\sum_m \lambda_m B_m$ can be satisfied by expressing a dual variable, typically λ_1 , as a function of the other variables, leading to a further inequality ensuring this function to be positive. Afterwards, the two remaining inequalities can be ensured by enforcing two dual variables, e.g., λ_2, λ_3 , to belong to a given interval $[0, U(\lambda_m)]$. Setting $\lambda_1 = \frac{\sum_{m \geq 2} \lambda_m B_m}{B_1}$, $\lambda_m = \theta_m^2, m \geq 4$ and $\lambda_m = \frac{U(\lambda_m) \theta_m^2}{1 + \theta_m^2}, m = 2, 3$, and multiplying the polynomial by $\prod_{m=2,3} (1 + \theta_m^2)^4$ allows obtaining a polynomial in θ , that should be non-positive everywhere.

Suppose now all $C_m = 0$. Dualization of the inner problem implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} &= \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \lambda_m \geq 0}} \sum_m \left(\lambda_m A_m + \lambda_m \langle F_m, z \rangle + \lambda_m G_m \|z\|^2 \right) \\ \text{s.t. Dualization over } \tau &: \sum_m \lambda_m = 1 \\ \text{Dualization over } f_z &: \sum_m \lambda_m B_m = 0 \\ \text{Dualization over } g_z &: \sum_m \lambda_m E_m z = - \sum_m \lambda_m D_m. \end{aligned}$$

Eliminating z and multiplying by $(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m)^2$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} &= \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \lambda_m \geq 0}} \left(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m \right)^2 \sum_m \lambda_m A_m - \left(\sum_m \lambda_m E_m \right) \sum_m \sum_l \lambda_m \lambda_l \langle F_m, D_l \rangle + \left(\sum_m \lambda_m G_m \right) \left\| \sum_m \lambda_m D_m \right\|^2 \\ \text{s.t. } &\sum_m \lambda_m = 1, \sum_m \lambda_m B_m = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Again, this can be expressed as requiring a polynomial of degree 3 in λ , whose coefficients are linear in the function values and Gram matrix, to be non-positive on a specific domain, which can be reformulated as requiring another polynomial to be non-positive everywhere.

The case of operators follows the same lines, except with all $B_m = 0$. \square

APPENDIX C SMOOTH FUNCTIONS SATISFYING A QUADRATIC ŁOJASIEWICZ CONDITION

APPENDIX C.1 DERIVATION OF THE ONE-POINT STRENGTHENING: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.2

Proof. Without loss of generality, we let $f_\star, x_\star = 0$. The pairwise one-point strengthening of $p_{L,\mu,L}$ on \mathbb{R}^d is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L} &= \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_z \in \mathbb{R}}} \tau \\ \text{s.t. } f_z - f_i + \frac{1}{2} \langle g_z + g_i, x_i - z \rangle - \frac{L}{4} \|z - x_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{4L} \|g_z - g_i\|^2 &\leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2, \star \quad (\mu_i) \\ f_i - f_z + \frac{1}{2} \langle g_i + g_z, z - x_i \rangle - \frac{L}{4} \|z - x_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{4L} \|g_z - g_i\|^2 &\leq \tau, \quad i = 1, 2, \star \quad (\lambda_i) \\ f_z - \frac{1}{2\mu} \|g_z\|^2 &\leq \tau \quad (\alpha_1) \\ -f_z &\leq \tau, \quad (\alpha_2) \end{aligned}$$

where α_1 , α_2 , and λ_i, μ_i , $i = 1, 2, \star$ are the dual coefficients. Dualization of the inner problem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L} \geq & \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \lambda_i \geq 0, \mu_i \geq 0, \\ \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \geq 0}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\lambda_i (f_i + \frac{1}{2} \langle g_i + g_z^\star, z - x_i \rangle - \frac{L}{4} \|z - x_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{4L} \|g_z^\star - g_i\|^2) \right. \\ & + \mu_i (-f_i + \frac{1}{2} \langle g_z^\star + g_i, x_i - z \rangle - \frac{L}{4} \|z - x_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{4L} \|g_z^\star - g_i\|^2) \\ & \left. - \alpha_1 \frac{\|g_z^\star\|^2}{2\mu} \right) \\ \text{s.t. } & \frac{1}{2} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i + \alpha_2 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_i + \alpha_1, \\ & 0 = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left((\mu_i + \lambda_i) \frac{1}{2L} (g_z^\star - g_i) + \frac{\lambda_i - \mu_i}{2} (z - x_i) \right) - \alpha_1 \frac{g_z^\star}{\mu}, \\ & 0 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\mu_i + \lambda_i}{2L} - \frac{\alpha_1}{\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \star\}$, g_z^\star minimizes the inner problem in $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$, and the last condition ensures that g_z^\star is a minimizer and no maximizer.

In particular, setting all dual coefficients to 0 except for $\alpha_2 = \mu_i = \frac{1}{2}$, for a given $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $z = x_i - \frac{g_i}{L}$ and $g_z^\star = 0$ leads to a feasible solution of $-f_i + \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L}$, hence (3.3) cannot be satisfied unless this quantity is negative.

In addition, setting all dual coefficients to 0 except for $\alpha_1 \leq \frac{\mu}{2L+\mu}$, $\lambda_j = \frac{1}{2}$, $\mu_i = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_1$, for any $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$, and maximizing over z , leads to a feasible solution

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L} \geq & -f_i + f_j + \frac{1}{2} \langle g_i + g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2 - \frac{L}{4} \|x_i - x_j\|^2 \\ & + \frac{\alpha_1}{(1-2\alpha_1)(\mu - (L+\mu)\alpha_1)} \left((1-2\alpha_1)^2(L+\mu)(f_i - f_\star - \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L}) - (L-\mu)(f_j - f_\star + \frac{\|g_j\|^2}{2L}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$ cannot be satisfied unless this quantity is negative for all $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \frac{\mu}{2L+\mu}$, and in particular for its maximal value with respect to α_1 . Setting $\alpha = 2\alpha_1$, it holds that $\tilde{p}_{L,\mu,L}$ is at least as strong as (3.3). \square

APPENDIX C.2 DERIVATION OF A SOS REFORMULATION: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.4

Proof. The first conditions are strictly equivalent to the first ones in (3.3). The last inequality in (3.3) can be equivalently written as

$$(c.1) \quad 0 \geq A + \frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)(2\mu - (L+\mu)\alpha)} ((1-\alpha)^2 B - C), \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \left(-f_i + f_j + \frac{1}{2} \langle g_i + g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{4L} \|g_i - g_j\|^2 - \frac{L}{4} \|x_i - x_j\|^2 \right) \\ B &= (L+\mu) \left(f_i - f_\star - \frac{\|g_i\|^2}{2L} \right) \\ C &= (L-\mu) \left(f_j - f_\star + \frac{\|g_j\|^2}{2L} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the interval $[0, \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}]$, $\alpha \leq \frac{2\mu}{L+\mu} \leq 1$, hence (c.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq (1-\alpha)(2\mu - (L+\mu)\alpha)A + (1-\alpha)^2\alpha B - \alpha C, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}] \\ \Leftrightarrow 0 &\geq 2\mu A + \alpha(B - C - (L+3\mu)A) + \alpha^2((L+\mu)A - 2B) + \alpha^3 B, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}] \\ \Leftrightarrow 0 &\geq a_0 + a_1\alpha + a_2\alpha^2 + a_3\alpha^3 := P(\alpha), \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}], \end{aligned}$$

where $a_0 = 2\mu A$, $a_1 = B - C - (L+3\mu)A$, $a_2 = (L+\mu)A - 2B$ and $a_3 = B$.

By Markov-Lukacs theorem, see, e.g., [49, Theorem 1.21],

$$P(\alpha) \leq 0, \forall \alpha \in [0, \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}] \Leftrightarrow \exists M, \bar{M} \succcurlyeq 0 \text{ s.t. } P(\alpha) = -\alpha \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha \end{bmatrix} M \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix} - (\frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu} - \alpha) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha \end{bmatrix} \bar{M} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix}$$

This condition can be stated linearly in terms of the coefficients of M, \bar{M} and those of $P(\cdot)$. Denoting the i, j^{th} entrance of M by M_{ij} , $i, j \in [2]$, the list of constraints is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}\bar{M}_{11} &= -a_0, & M_{11} - \bar{M}_{11} + \frac{4\mu}{2L+\mu}\bar{M}_{12} &= -a_1 \\ 2M_{12} - 2\bar{M}_{12} + \frac{2\mu}{2L+\mu}\bar{M}_{22} &= -a_2, & M_{22} - \bar{M}_{22} &= -a_3. \end{aligned}$$

□

APPENDIX D CONVEX BLOCKWISE SMOOTH FUNCTIONS

APPENDIX D.1 DERIVATION OF THE ONE-POINT STRENGTHENING: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.6

Proof. The terwise one-point strengthening of $p_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ on \mathbb{R}^d is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}} &= \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_z \in \mathbb{R}}} \tau \\ \text{s.t. } &f_z - f_i + \langle g_z, x_i - z \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_z^{(m)} - g_i^{(m)}\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket, m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket \quad (\mu_{i,m}) \\ &f_i - f_z + \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_z^{(m)} - g_i^{(m)}\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket, m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket \quad (\lambda_{i,m}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{i,m}, \mu_{i,m}$, $i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket$, $m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$, are the associated dual coefficients. Dualization of the inner problem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}} &= \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \mu_{i,m} \geq 0, \\ \lambda_{i,m} \geq 0}} \sum_i \sum_m \mu_{i,m} (-f_i + \langle g_z^*, x_i - z \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_z^{*(m)} - g_i^{(m)}\|^2) + \lambda_{i,m} (f_i + \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_z^{*(m)} - g_i^{(m)}\|^2) \\ \text{s.t. } &\sum_i \sum_m \mu_{i,m} = \sum_i \sum_m \lambda_{i,m} = \frac{1}{2}, \text{ and } \forall m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, \\ &\sum_i \sum_m \left(\mu_{i,m} (x_i^{(m)} - z^{(m)}) + \mu_{i,m} \frac{g_z^{*(m)} - g_i^{(m)}}{L_m} + \lambda_{i,m} \frac{g_z^{*(m)} - g_i^{(m)}}{L_m} \right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where g_z^\star minimizes the inner problem in $\tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$. In particular, setting all dual coefficients to 0 except for $\mu_{i,m} = \frac{1}{2}$, $\lambda_{k,l}$ and $\lambda_{j,l} = \frac{1}{2} - \lambda_{k,l}$ for some $i, j \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket$ and $m, l \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ fixed yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda_{k,l} \right) (-f_i + f_j + \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_i^{(m)} - g_j^{(m)}\|^2) \\ & + \lambda_{k,l} (-f_i + f_k + \langle g_k, x_i - x_k \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_i^{(m)} - g_k^{(m)}\|^2) \\ & + \lambda_{k,l} (1 - 2\lambda_{k,l}) \left(\max_l \frac{1}{2L_l} \|g_j^{(l)} - g_k^{(l)}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_j^{(m)} - g_k^{(m)}\|^2 \right), \quad \forall m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, \quad \forall \lambda_{k,l} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\lambda = 2\lambda_{k,l}$ yields (3.5), hence $\tilde{p}_{0,\mathbb{L}}$ is at least as strong as (3.5). \square

APPENDIX D.2 DERIVATION OF A SOS REFORMULATION: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.9

Proof. Condition (3.5) can be equivalently expressed as

$$0 \geq (1 - \lambda)A_{ijm} + \lambda A_{ikm} + \lambda(1 - \lambda)B_{jkm} := P(\lambda), \quad \forall m \in \llbracket n \rrbracket, \quad \forall \lambda \in [0, 1],$$

where $A_{ijm} = -f_i + f_j + \langle g_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_i^{(m)} - g_j^{(m)}\|^2 \leq 0$, and $B_{jkm} = \max_l \frac{1}{2L_l} \|g_j^{(l)} - g_k^{(l)}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2L_m} \|g_j^{(m)} - g_k^{(m)}\|^2 \geq 0$.

By Markov-Lukasc theorem [49, Theorem 1.21],

$$P(\lambda) \leq 0, \forall \lambda \in [0, 1] \Leftrightarrow \exists M \succ 0, K \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } P(\lambda) = - \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \lambda \end{bmatrix} M \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix} - \lambda(1 - \lambda)K.$$

This condition can be stated linearly in terms of the coefficients of M , of K and of the coefficients of $P(\cdot)$. Denoting the i, j^{th} entrance of M by M_{ij} , $i, j \in [2]$, the list of constraints is given by

$$M_{11} = -A_{ijm}, \quad 2M_{12} + K = A_{ijm} - A_{ikm} - B_{jkm}, \quad M_{22} - K = B_{jkm}.$$

\square

APPENDIX E STRONGLY MONOTONE LIPSCHITZ OPERATORS

APPENDIX E.1 DERIVATION OF THE ONE-POINT STRENGTHENING: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.12

Proof. The terwise one-point strengthening of $q_{\mu,L}$ on \mathbb{R}^d is given by

$$\tilde{q}_{\mu,L} = \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ t_z \in \mathbb{R}^d}} \tau \text{ s.t. } \frac{\|t_z - t_i\|^2}{2L} - \frac{L}{2} \|z - x_i\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket \quad (\lambda_i)$$

$$- \langle t_z - t_i, z - x_i \rangle + \mu \|z - x_i\|^2 \leq \tau, \quad i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket \quad (\mu_i)$$

where λ_i, μ_i are the associated dual coefficients. Dualization of the inner problem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_{\mu,L} \geq & \frac{1}{2L} \max_{\substack{\lambda_i \geq 0, \\ \mu_i \geq 0}} \sum_i \left(-\lambda_i (\|t_z^\star - t_i\|^2 - L^2 \|z - x_i\|^2) + \mu_i 2L (-\langle t_z^\star - t_i, z - x_i \rangle + \mu \|z - x_i\|^2) \right) \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_i \frac{1}{L} \lambda_i (t_z^\star - t_i) - \mu_i (z - x_i) = 0, \quad \sum_i (\lambda_i + \mu_i) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where t_z^\star minimizes the inner problem in $\tilde{q}_{\mu,L}$. Minimizing over z , multiplying by $2L((\sum_i \lambda_i)^2 + (\sum_i \mu_i)^2)$ and rearranging the terms yields

$$\tilde{q}_{\mu,L} \geq \max_{\substack{\lambda_i \geq 0, \mu_i \geq 0, \\ \sum_i (\lambda_i + \mu_i) = 1}} \sum_{i,j \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket: j > i} \left(A_{ij}(\lambda_i \lambda_j \sum_k \lambda_k + \lambda_i \mu_j (\sum_k \mu_k) + \lambda_j \mu_i (\sum_k \mu_k) - (\sum_k \lambda_k) \mu_i \mu_j - 2\mu (\sum_k \mu_k) \lambda_i \lambda_j) \right. \\ \left. + B_{ij}(\mu_i \mu_j \sum_k \mu_k + \mu_i \lambda_j (\sum_k \lambda_k) + \mu_j \lambda_i (\sum_k \lambda_k) - (\sum_k \mu_k) \lambda_i \lambda_j - 2\mu (\sum_k \lambda_k) \mu_i \mu_j) \right),$$

where $A_{ij} = \|t_i - t_j\|^2 - L^2 \|x_i - x_j\|^2$ and $B_{ij} = -2L \langle t_i - t_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + 2L\mu \|x_i - x_j\|^2$.

This condition is homogeneous of degree 3 in λ_k, μ_i, μ_j . Hence, for any $K \geq 0$, it must hold with $\tilde{\mu}_i = K\mu_i, \tilde{\lambda}_i = K\lambda_i$ replacing μ_i, λ_i respectively, which allows removing the condition $\sum_i (\lambda_i + \mu_i) = 1$.

Setting only λ_k, μ_i and μ_j non-zero yields the first condition in (3.8), and setting only μ_k, λ_i and λ_j non-zero yields the second condition in (3.8), hence $\tilde{q}_{\mu,L}$ is at least as strong as (3.8). \square

APPENDIX E.2 DERIVATION OF A SOS REFORMULATION: PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.15

Proof. Take the first condition in (3.8), and set $\lambda_k = \gamma^2, \mu_i = \theta^2$ and $\mu_j = \alpha^2$. The condition becomes

$$0 \geq \gamma^2(\alpha^2 + \theta^2)(A_{ik}\theta^2 + A_{jk}\alpha^2) - \gamma^2\theta^2\alpha^2 A_{ij} + \gamma^4(B_{ik}\theta^2 + B_{jk}\alpha^2) + B_{ij}\theta^2\alpha^2(\theta^2 + \alpha^2 - 2\mu\gamma^2) = P(\alpha, \theta, \gamma).$$

$P(\alpha, \theta, \gamma)$ is an homogeneous polynomial of 3 variables and degree 6, which must be negative for all $\theta, \alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. This negativity condition can be relaxed by requiring P to be Sum of Squares, that is, by requiring the existence of some $M \preceq 0$ such that

$$P(\alpha, \theta, \gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2\theta & \alpha^2\gamma & \alpha\theta^2 & \alpha\gamma^2 & \alpha\theta\gamma & \theta^2\gamma & \theta\gamma^2 \end{pmatrix} M \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2\theta & \alpha^2\gamma & \alpha\theta^2 & \alpha\gamma^2 & \alpha\theta\gamma & \theta^2\gamma & \theta\gamma^2 \end{pmatrix}^\top,$$

which can be stated linearly in terms of the coefficients of M and those of $P(\cdot)$. Denoting the i, j^{th} entrance of M by $M_{i,j}$, $i, j \in \llbracket 7 \rrbracket$, the list of constraints is given by

$$M_{1,1} = M_{3,3} = B_{ij}$$

$$M_{2,2} = A_{jk}$$

$$M_{4,4} = B_{jk}$$

$$M_{6,6} = A_{ik}$$

$$M_{7,7} = B_{ik}$$

$$M_{5,5} + 2M_{1,7} + 2M_{2,6} + 2M_{3,4} = -A_{ij} + A_{ik} + A_{jk} - 2\mu B_{ij}$$

$$M_{1,2} = M_{1,3} = M_{2,4} = M_{3,6} = M_{4,7} = M_{6,7} = 0$$

$$M_{1,5} + M_{2,3} = M_{1,4} + M_{2,5} = M_{1,6} + M_{3,5} = M_{2,7} + M_{4,5} = M_{3,7} + M_{5,6} = M_{4,6} + M_{5,7} = 0.$$

Translating the second condition in (3.8) follows exactly the same argument, with $A_{(\cdot)}$ and $B_{(\cdot)}$ inverted. \square

APPENDIX F STRONGLY MONOTONE COCOERCIVE OPERATORS

This section studies the class $\mathcal{Q}_{\mu,\beta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of strongly monotone cocoercive operators, that is operators T satisfying, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ [7, 48],

$$(q_{\mu,\beta}) \quad q_{\mu,\beta}^{xy} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \langle T(x) - T(y), x - y \rangle \geq \mu \|x - y\|^2 \\ \langle T(x) - T(y), x - y \rangle \geq \beta \|T(x) - T(y)\|^2, \end{cases}$$

where again we use the notation q instead of p to denote a property.

Similarly to the case of monotone Lipschitz operators, $q_{\mu,\beta}$ is a pairwise interpolation condition on \mathbb{R}^d , and a global interpolation condition when $d = 1$. However, when $K \geq 3$ or $d \geq 2$, $q_{\mu,L}$ is only necessary for interpolation and is no longer a K -wise interpolation condition. [48, Proposition 4].

APPENDIX F.1 DERIVATION OF THE ONE-POINT STRENGTHENING

We thus strengthen $q_{\mu,\beta}$, starting with a set of cardinality 3.

Proposition F.1. Consider $Q = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3)\}$, and $q_{\mu,\beta}$. Then, $\tilde{q}_{\mu,\beta}$, the terwise one-point strengthening of $q_{\mu,\beta}$ with respect to \mathbb{R}^d , is satisfied only if

(F.1)

$$\tilde{q}_{\mu,\beta}^{ijk} \leq 0 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \forall \lambda_k, \mu_i, \mu_j \geq 0, \\ 0 \geq \lambda_k(\mu_i + \mu_j)(B_{ik}\mu_i + B_{jk}\mu_j) - \lambda_k\mu_i\mu_j B_{ij} + \lambda_k^2(A_{ik}\mu_i + A_{jk}\mu_j) + A_{ij}\mu_i\mu_j(\mu_i + \mu_j + 2\lambda_k - 4\beta\mu\lambda_k), \\ 0 \geq \lambda_k(\mu_i + \mu_j)(A_{ik}\mu_i + A_{jk}\mu_j) - \lambda_k\mu_i\mu_j A_{ij} + \lambda_k^2(B_{ik}\mu_i + B_{jk}\mu_j) + B_{ij}\mu_i\mu_j(\mu_i + \mu_j + 2\lambda_k - 4\beta\mu\lambda_k). \end{cases}$$

where $A_{ij} = -\langle t_i - t_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \mu\|x_i - x_j\|^2$ and $B_{ij} = -\langle t_i - t_j, x_i - x_j \rangle + \beta\|t_i - t_j\|^2$.

Proof. The terwise one-point strengthening of $q_{\mu,\beta}$ on \mathbb{R}^d is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_{\mu,\beta} &= \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\substack{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, \\ t_z \in \mathbb{R}^d}} \tau \\ \text{s.t. } & -\langle t_z - t_i, z - x_i \rangle + \beta\|t_z - t_i\|^2 \leq \tau, & i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket & (\lambda_i) \\ & -\langle t_z - t_i, z - x_i \rangle + \mu\|z - x_i\|^2 \leq \tau, & i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket, & (\mu_i) \end{aligned}$$

where λ_i, μ_i are the associated dual coefficients. Dualization of the inner problem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_{\mu,\beta} &\geq \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \lambda_i, \mu_i \geq 0}} \sum_i \left(\lambda_i(-\langle t_z - t_i, z - x_i \rangle + \beta\|t_z - t_i\|^2) + \mu_i(-\langle t_z - t_i, z - x_i \rangle + \mu\|z - x_i\|^2) \right) \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_i 2\beta\lambda_i(t_z^* - t_i) - (\lambda_i + \mu_i)(z - x_i) = 0, \quad \sum_i (\lambda_i + \mu_i) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where t_z^* minimizes the inner problem in $\tilde{q}_{\mu,\beta}$. Minimizing over z , multiplying by $1 - 4\beta\mu(\sum_i \lambda_i)(\sum_i \mu_i)$ and rearranging the terms yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \max_{\substack{\lambda_i, \mu_i \geq 0 \\ 4\beta\mu(\sum_i \lambda_i)(\sum_i \mu_i) \leq 1 \\ \sum_i (\lambda_i + \mu_i) = 1}} \sum_{i,j \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket: j > i} \left(B_{ij}(\lambda_i\lambda_j \sum_k \lambda_k + \lambda_i\mu_j(\sum_k \mu_k) + \lambda_j\mu_i(\sum_k \mu_k) + (2 - 4\beta\mu)(\sum_k \mu_k)\lambda_i\lambda_j - (\sum_k \lambda_k)\mu_i\mu_j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A_{ij}(\mu_i\mu_j \sum_k \mu_k + (\mu_i\lambda_j(\sum_k \lambda_k) + \mu_j\lambda_i(\sum_k \lambda_k) + (2 - 4\beta\mu)(\sum_k \lambda_k)\mu_i\mu_j - (\sum_k \mu_k)\lambda_i\lambda_j)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This condition is homogeneous of degree 3 in λ_k, μ_i, μ_j . Hence, for any $K \geq 0$, it must hold with $\tilde{\mu}_i = K\mu_i, \tilde{\lambda}_i = K\lambda_i$ replacing μ_i, λ_i respectively, which allows removing the conditions $\sum_i (\lambda_i + \mu_i) = 1$ and $4\beta\mu(\sum_i \lambda_i)(\sum_i \mu_i) \leq 1$.

Setting only λ_k, μ_i and μ_j non-zero yields the first condition in (F.1), and setting only μ_k, λ_i and λ_j non-zero yields the second condition in (F.1), hence $\tilde{q}_{\mu,\beta}$ is at least as strong as (F.1). \square

Remark F.2. Setting $\lambda_k = 0$ in (F.1) allows recovering $q_{\mu,\beta}$, hence again this relaxation of $\tilde{q}_{\mu,\beta}$ is at least as strong as $q_{\mu,\beta}$. Given the example illustrated in Figure 5, (F.1) is actually strictly stronger than $q_{\mu,\beta}$.

APPENDIX F.2 DERIVATION OF A SOS REFORMULATION

Similarly to Section 3.3, we propose a relaxation of (F.1) as an SDP.

Proposition F.3. *With the same notation as in Proposition F.1 and considering a triplet $S = \{(x_i, t_i)\}_{i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket}$, it holds that S satisfies (F.1) if and only if $\forall i, j, k \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket$, there exists some $M_{A,B}^{ijk} \succcurlyeq 0$, $M_{B,A}^{ijk} \succcurlyeq 0$, where*

$$(F.2) \quad M_{\alpha,\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} -\beta_{ij} & 0 & 0 & M_{14} & M_{15} & M_{16} & M_{17} \\ 0 & -\alpha_{jk} & M_{23} & 0 & M_{25} & M_{26} & M_{27} \\ 0 & M_{23} & -\beta_{ij} & M_{34} & M_{35} & 0 & M_{37} \\ M_{14} & 0 & M_{34} & -\beta_{jk} & M_{45} & M_{46} & 0 \\ M_{15} & M_{25} & M_{35} & M_{45} & M_{55} & M_{56} & M_{57} \\ M_{16} & M_{26} & 0 & M_{46} & M_{56} & -\alpha_{ik} & 0 \\ M_{17} & M_{27} & M_{37} & 0 & M_{57} & 0 & -\beta_{ik} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$M_{14} + M_{25} = M_{15} + M_{23} = M_{16} + M_{35} = M_{27} + M_{45} = M_{37} + M_{56} = M_{46} + M_{57} = 0$$

$$M_{55} + 2M_{17} + 2M_{26} + 2M_{34} = \alpha_{ij} - \alpha_{jk} - \alpha_{ik} - (2 - 4\beta\mu)\beta_{ij}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as that of Proposition 3.15. \square

We illustrate in Figure 5 the difference in datasets satisfying $q_{\mu,\beta}$ as compared to (F.1).




Figure 5: Allowed regions for t_3 , according to $q_{\mu,\beta}$ or (F.1), given $\mu = \frac{1}{2}$, $\beta = 1$, $(x_1, t_1) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, $(x_2, t_2) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1/2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$, $x_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 \\ 1/2 \end{pmatrix}$.

APPENDIX G UNIFORMLY CONVEX FUNCTIONS

This section studies the class $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of uniformly convex functions f satisfying, $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ [28],

$$(p_{\mu,q}) \quad p_{\mu,q}^{xy} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow f(x) \geq f(y) + \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - y\|^q, \text{ where } \mu \geq 0, q \geq 2,$$

We first prove that $p_{\mu,q}$ serves as a pairwise extension condition for $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proposition G.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, $p_{\mu,q}$ is a pairwise extension condition for $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. Consider a set $S = \{(x_i, f_i, g_i)\}_{i=1,2}$ satisfying $p_{\mu,q}$. We show that, given any arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $p_{\mu,q}$ can be extended to x . To this end, we propose quantities $f \in \mathbb{R}, g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ extending $p_{\mu,q}$ to x , that is such that $\forall i, j = 1, 2$, it holds

$$(G.1) \quad f \geq f_i + \langle g_i, x - x_i \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - x_i\|^q,$$

$$(G.2) \quad f_j \geq f + \langle g, x_j - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - x_j\|^q.$$

Let

$$i_\star = \operatorname{argmax}_{i=1,2} (f_i + \langle g_i, x - x_i \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - x_i\|^q),$$

$$f = f_{i_\star} + \langle g_{i_\star}, x - x_{i_\star} \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - x_{i_\star}\|^q, \quad g = g_{i_\star} + \mu \|x - x_{i_\star}\|^{q-2} (x - x_{i_\star}) + K(x - x_{i_\star}),$$

where $K \geq 0$. Then, (G.1) is automatically satisfied. In addition, it holds

$$f + \langle g, x_{i_\star} - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - x_{i_\star}\|^q = f_{i_\star} - \mu \|x - x_{i_\star}\|^q + 2 \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - x_{i_\star}\|^q - K \|x - x_{i_\star}\| \leq f_{i_\star},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & f + \langle g, x_j - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|x - x_j\|^q \\ &= f_{i_\star} + \langle g_{i_\star}, x_j - x_{i_\star} \rangle + \langle K(x - x_{i_\star}), x_j - x \rangle + \mu \|x - x_{i_\star}\|^{q-2} \langle x - x_{i_\star}, x_j - x \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} (\|x - x_{i_\star}\|^q + \|x - x_j\|^q) \\ &\leq f_j - \langle K X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} (\|X_{i_\star}\|^q + \|X_j\|^q - \|X_{i_\star} - X_j\|^q - q \|X_{i_\star}\|^{q-2} \langle X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle), \end{aligned}$$

where $X_{i_\star} = x - x_{i_\star}$ and $X_j = x - x_j$. Suppose first $\langle X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle \leq 0$, and let $K = 0$. Then, by Bernoulli's inequality, and since $(x + y)^q \geq x^q + y^q$ for $q \geq 2, x, y \geq 0$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{i_\star} - X_j\|^q &= (\|X_{i_\star}\|^2 + \|X_j\|^2 - 2 \langle X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle)^{q/2} = (\|X_{i_\star}\|^2 + \|X_j\|^2)^{q/2} (1 - 2 \frac{\langle X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle}{\|X_{i_\star}\|^2 + \|X_j\|^2})^{q/2} \\ &\geq \|X_{i_\star}\|^q + \|X_j\|^q - q \langle X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle (\|X_{i_\star}\|^2 + \|X_j\|^2)^{q/2-1} \geq \|X_{i_\star}\|^q + \|X_j\|^q - q \langle X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle \|X_{i_\star}\|^{q-2}, \end{aligned}$$

hence (G.2) holds. Suppose now $\langle X_{i_\star}, X_j \rangle > 0$. Then there exists a sufficiently large K such that (G.2) holds. \square

Relying on the refinement procedure of Section 2.1, we now show that $p_{\mu,q}$ can be strengthened by considering sets of higher cardinality.

Proposition G.2. Consider $Q = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3)\}$, and $p_{\mu,q}$. Then, $\tilde{p}_{\mu,q}$, the terwise one-point strengthening of $p_{\mu,q}$ on \mathbb{R}^d , is satisfied only if

$$(G.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{\mu,q}^{ijk} \leq 0 \Rightarrow 0 \geq \max_{\lambda \in [0,1]} & \lambda(-f_i + f_k + \langle g_k, x_i - x_k \rangle) + (1 - \lambda)(-f_j + f_k + \langle g_k, x_j - x_k \rangle) \\ & + \frac{\mu}{q} ((\lambda(1 - \lambda)^q + (1 - \lambda)\lambda^q) \|x_i - x_j\|^q + \|x_k - \lambda x_i - (1 - \lambda)x_j\|^q). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The terwise one-point strengthening of $p_{\mu,q}$ on \mathbb{R}^d is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{\mu,q} &= \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}, g_z \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_z \in \mathbb{R}} \tau \text{ s.t. } -f_z + f_i + \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|z - x_i\|^q \leq \tau, \quad i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket \quad (\lambda_i) \\ & \quad -f_i + f_z - \langle g_z, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|z - x_i\|^q \leq \tau, \quad i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket \quad (\mu_i) \end{aligned}$$

where λ_i, μ_i ($i \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket$) are the associated dual coefficients. Dualization of the inner problem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{\mu,q} &= \max_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \lambda_i, \mu_i \geq 0}} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\lambda_i (f_i + \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|z - x_i\|^q) + \mu_i (-f_i - \langle g_i, z - x_i \rangle + \frac{\mu}{q} \|z - x_i\|^q) \right) \\ \text{s.t. } &\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i = \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i = \frac{1}{2}, \quad z = 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 (\mu_i x_i). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, setting only $\lambda_k = \frac{1}{2}$, $\mu_i, \mu_j = \frac{1}{2} - \mu_i$ non-zero yields a feasible solution of

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq &\mu_i (-f_i + f_k + \langle g_k, x_i - x_k \rangle) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \mu_i \right) (-f_j + f_k + \langle g_k, x_j - x_k \rangle) \\ &+ \frac{\mu}{q} \left(\left(\mu_i \left(\frac{1}{2} - \mu_i \right)^q + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \mu_i \right) \mu_i^q \right) \|x_j - x_i\|^q + \|x_k - \mu_i x_i - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \mu_i \right) x_j\|^q \right), \forall \mu_i \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\tilde{p}_{\mu,L}$ is at least as strong as (G.3). \square

Remark C.3. Setting $\lambda = 1$ in (G.3) allows recovering $p_{\mu,q}$.

Remark C.4. The case $p = 2$ can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}_{\mu,2}^{ijk} \leq 0 \Rightarrow &0 \geq \lambda (-f_i + f_k + \langle g_k, x_i - x_k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_i - x_k\|^2) + (1 - \lambda) (-f_j + f_k + \langle g_k, x_j - x_k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_i - x_k\|^2) \\ \Leftrightarrow &f_i \geq f_k + \langle g_k, x_i - x_k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_i - x_k\|^2 \text{ and } f_j \geq f_k + \langle g_k, x_j - x_k \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|x_j - x_k\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We recover the classical definition of μ -strongly convex functions.

APPENDIX H SMOOTH CONVEX FUNCTIONS WITH CONSTRAINED CONVEX DOMAIN

Given an open convex subset $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, consider the class $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\bar{Q})$ of functions that are smooth and convex on \bar{Q} , in the sense of $(p_{0,L})$, but not necessarily outside of \bar{Q} . It is known that $p_{0,L}''$ no longer holds in general for this function class [15, Section 2], but that it remains valid for pairs (x, y) of points $x, y \in \bar{Q}$ that are sufficiently close. In particular, it holds at every $x, y \in \bar{Q}$ such that [15, Theorem 3.1]

$$(H.1) \quad \|x - y\| < \text{dist}(y, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q}),$$

This result is obtained by showing that in this case, all quantities involved in the strengthening of $p_{0,L}'$ into $p_{0,L}''$ belong to \bar{Q} . Building on the iterative strengthening of $p_{0,L}$, we improve this description by showing $p_{0,L}''$ holds at pairs that are twice as distant.

Proposition H.1. *Let $\bar{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ an open convex set and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\bar{Q})$. Then, for any $x, y \in \bar{Q}$ such that*

$$(H.2) \quad \|x - y\| < 2 \text{dist}(y, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q}),$$

it holds

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle + \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2.$$

Proof. Let $z = y + \frac{g(x) - g(y)}{2L}$. It holds

$$\|z - y\| = \frac{1}{2L} \|g(y) - g(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|y - x\| \stackrel{(H.2)}{<} \text{dist}(y, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q}),$$

hence $z \in \bar{Q}$. Setting $x_2 = x$ and $x_1 = y$ in the proof of Proposition 2.9, observe that the strengthening of $p_{0,L}$ into $p_{0,L}''$ remains valid since it only involves quantities belonging to \bar{Q} . \square

Building on [15, Theorem 3.1], the author of [15] obtained properties valid for all $x, y \in \bar{Q}$, however far from each other, that consists of bounds on $f(y) - f(x)$, solutions to given optimization problems. Relying on Proposition H.1 instead of [15, Theorem 3.1] allows improving this description of $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\bar{Q})$.

Corollary H.2 (From [15], Corollary 3.2). *Given $\{(x, g_x, f_x), (y, g_y, f_y)\} \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})^2$, let*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_N(\text{resp. } \mathcal{B}_N)(x, g_x, f_x, y, g_y) &= \max(\text{resp. } \min)_{g_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, f_i \in \mathbb{R}} f_N \\ \text{s.t. } \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i - g_{i+1}\|^2 &\leq f_i - f_{i+1} - \frac{1}{N} \langle g_{i+1}, x - y \rangle, & 0 \leq i < N \\ \frac{1}{2L} \|g_i - g_{i+1}\|^2 &\leq f_{i+1} - f_i - \frac{1}{N} \langle g_i, y - x \rangle, & 0 \leq i < N \\ f_0 &= f_x, g_0 = g_x, g_N = g_y. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

1. If $f \in \mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\bar{Q})$, then for any $x, y \in \bar{Q}$, and $\forall N > \frac{\|x-y\|}{2 \min(\text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q}), \text{dist}(y, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q}))}$,

$$\mathcal{B}_N(x, \nabla f(x), f(x), y, \nabla f(y)) \leq f(y) \leq \mathcal{U}_N(x, \nabla f(x), f(x), y, \nabla f(y)).$$

2. If $\{(x, g_x, f_x), (y, g_y, f_y)\} \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})^2$ satisfy, for some $L, N > 0$,

$$\mathcal{B}_N(x, g_x, f_x, y, g_y) \leq f_y \leq \mathcal{U}_N(x, g_x, f_x, y, g_y),$$

then there exists a function $f \in \mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\bar{Q})$ such that $f(x) = f_x$, $f(y) = f_y$, $\nabla f(x) = g_x$, and $\nabla f(y) = g_y$.

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as in [15, Corollary 3.2], replacing Proposition [15, Theorem 3.1] by Proposition H.1. \square

In [15, Corollary 3.2], a similar result is proved, except for the factor 2 in the definition of N : Corollary H.2 allows bounding $f(y)$ by $\mathcal{U}_N, \mathcal{B}_N$ for twice smaller values of N than [15, Corollary 3.2].

To illustrate how this strengthens the description of $\mathcal{F}_{0,L}(\bar{Q})$, consider the following numerical example, from [15, Figure 3]. Given $f : \bar{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, suppose $L = 1$, $x = 0$, $\nabla f(x) = 0$, $f(x) = 0$, $\|y\|^2 = 1$, $\|\nabla f(y)\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\min(\text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q}), \text{dist}(y, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q})) = 1$. We show in Figure 6 the allowed regions for $f(y)$ as a function of $\langle \nabla f(y), y \rangle$, according to [15, Corollary 3.2] and Corollary H.2.




Figure 6: From [15, Figure 3]. Allowed regions for $f(y)$ as a function of $\langle \nabla f(y), y \rangle$, according to [15, Corollary 3.2] and Corollary H.2, and given $L = 1$, $(x, f(x), \nabla f(x)) = (0, 0, 0)$, $\|y\|^2 = 1$, $\|\nabla f(y)\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\min(\text{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q}), \text{dist}(y, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \bar{Q})) = 1$. Corollary H.2 allows bounding f_y by $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{U}_1$, while [15, Corollary 3.2] can only rely on $\mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{U}_2$.