

(x) $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $x \leftarrow_k y \Rightarrow (y-x) + \varepsilon \in K$
 which leads to $\alpha(y-x) + \alpha\varepsilon \in K$ ($\forall \alpha > 0$)
 By definition of cones,

Now, since $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \alpha\varepsilon > 0$ can also be made small,
 we have that $\alpha(y-x) \in \text{int } K \Rightarrow \alpha x \leftarrow_k \alpha y$.

x) $x \leftarrow_k x \Rightarrow (x-x)=0 \in \text{int } K$, which is false
 since K is pointed and thus $0 \notin \text{int } K$.

xi) $x \leftarrow_k y \Rightarrow (y-x) \in \text{int } K$.

For $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small $(y-x) + \varepsilon \in \text{int } K$.

Now, let $\varepsilon = v-u$, $\forall u$ and v small enough,

then $(y-x) + (v-u) = (y+v) - (x+u) \in \text{int } K$,

which results in $x+u \leftarrow_k y+v$.

⑥ $S = \{(x, t) \mid \|x\|_2 \leq t\}$ SOC is self-dual
 Consider point $(y, r) \in S$. Thus, $\forall (x, t) \in S$,
 we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \\ t \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} y \\ r \end{bmatrix} = xy + tr \geq -\|x\|_2 \|y\|_2 + tr \geq$$

follows from
Cauchy-Swartz
inequality

$$\geq -t(r) + tr = 0$$

↑ follows from the fact that $(x, t), (y, r) \in S$,
 Thus, as $xy + tr \geq 0 \quad \forall (x, t) \in S$, the
 point $(y, r) \in S$ is also an element of the
 dual cone $S^* = \{y \mid xy \geq 0, \forall x \in S\}$.

It proves that $S \subseteq S^*$

Prove now that $S^* \subseteq S$

Consider any point $(y, r) \in S^*$.

Thus, $x^T y + tr \geq 0 \quad \forall (x, t) \in S$.

Without loss of generality, consider

$x = -y$ and $t = \|y\|_2 = \sqrt{y^T y}$, such that

$$x^T y + tr = -y^T y + \|y\|_2 r \geq 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$\Rightarrow r \geq \|y\|_2$$

Thus, $\forall (y, r) \in S^*$ we have that $\|y\| \leq r$, which leads to $(y, r) \in S$.

⑦ $S = \{(x, t) \mid \|x\|_1 \leq t\} \quad S^* - ?$

Lemma: Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a norm on \mathbb{R}^n . The dual cone associated with a norm-cone $S = \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \|x\| \leq t\}$ is the cone defined by the dual norm, i.e.,

$$S^* = \{(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \|y\|_* \leq s\} \text{ where}$$

$$\|y\|_* = \sup \{y^T x \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$$

Proof: This is equivalent to prove that

$$x^T y + ts \geq 0, \|x\| \leq t \Leftrightarrow \|y\|_* \leq s$$

(\Leftarrow): Assume $(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $\|y\|_* \leq s$, and consider a point $(x, t) \in S$ such that $\|x\| \leq t$ for some $t > 0$. Given that $\|x\| \leq t$ implies $\|x/t\| \leq 1$, we have from the definition of dual norm that

$$y^T \left(-\frac{x}{t}\right) \leq \sup \{y^T x \mid \|x\| \leq 1\} = \|y\|_* \leq s$$

Therefore $y^T(-\frac{x}{t}) \leq s$ leads to

$y^T x + ts \geq 0$, which proves that $(y, s) \in S^*$.

(\Rightarrow): By contradiction! Assume that

$(y, s) \in S^*$ but $\|y\|_* > s$,

By the definition of the dual norm,

$\|y\|_* = y^T x > s$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\|x\|_1 = 1$.

Therefore, choosing $t=1$ leads to

$x^T y + st \leq y^T(-x) + s \leq 0$, which

contradicts the assumption $(y, s) \in S^*$.
Thus, $(y, s) \in S^*$ implies that $\|y\|_* \leq s$. \blacksquare

Now, to prove $S_1 = S_\infty$ we only need to show that $(\|\cdot\|_1)_* = \|\cdot\|_\infty$.

Consider any two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We have that

$$y^T x = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i| |x_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i| \|x\|_1 \leq$$

$$\leq \max_i |y_i| \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i| = \|y\|_\infty \|x\|_1$$

First inequality follows from $\sum z_i \leq \sum |z_i|$
Second follows from the multiplicativity of the absolute value.

Last one follows from $\sum |z_i| \leq \max_j |z_j|$

Considering $\|x\|_1 \leq 1$, we have $y^T x \leq \|y\|_\infty$ with equality holding when $\|y\|_\infty = \sup_j y^T x$ by definition of ℓ_∞ norm.

Therefore, $\|y\|_\infty = \sup \{y^T x / \|x\|_1 \leq 1\}$,

which is exactly the definition
of the dual norm $(\|\cdot\|_1)_*$,

Finally, since $(\|\cdot\|_1)_* = \|\cdot\|_\infty$, we may
lead to

$$S_1^* = \{(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \|y\|_\infty \leq s\} = S_\infty$$