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ABSTRACT

We present here a simple method to approximate uniformly in Hilbert spaces uniformly continuous functions by $C^{1,1}$ functions. This method relies on explicit inf-convolution formulas or equivalently on the solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations.
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SIGNIFICANCE AND EXPLANATION

It is well-known that in finite dimensions one may regularize continuous functions (using convolution for example). The usual methods to do so fail in infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces. We propose here a method to solve this difficulty, which is based upon explicit formulas that are called inf-convolution formulas.

The responsibility for the wording and views expressed in this descriptive summary lies with MRC, and not with the authors of this report.
A REMARK ON REGULARIZATION IN HILBERT SPACES

J. M. Lasry and P. L. Lions

Introduction: Let $H$ be a Hilbert space and let us denote by $\| \cdot \|$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)$ its norm and scalar product respectively. Let $u \in \text{BUC}(H)$ - space of bounded uniformly continuous scalar functions. The problem we consider here concerns the approximation of $u$ by a sequence $u_\varepsilon$ of functions in $C^1_b(H)$ or even $C^1_{b,1}(H)$ such that $u_\varepsilon$ converges uniformly on $H$ to $u$. The usual way to find $u_\varepsilon$ in the case when $H$ is finite dimensional is to use convolution with smooth kernels: this method is not only explicit but enjoys a few important properties like for example:

1. $\sup_{H} |\nabla u_\varepsilon| \leq C_\varepsilon \sup_{H} |u|$

2. $\sup_{x \neq y} |\nabla u_\varepsilon(x) - \nabla u_\varepsilon(y)| |x-y|^{-1} \leq C_\varepsilon \sup_{H} |u|$

3. $\inf_{H} u < u_\varepsilon \leq \sup_{H} u$

4. $\sup_{H} |\nabla u_\varepsilon| \leq \sup_{x \neq y} |u(x) - u(y)| |x-y|^{-1} \leq C_\varepsilon$

In addition, the regularization commutes with translations, is uniformly bounded in $C^1_{b,1}$ if $u \in C^1_{b,1}$ and it is order-preserving ...

Unfortunately, this method breaks down when $H$ is infinite dimensional. Our goal here is to present a simple method which works for arbitrary Hilbert spaces and which still enjoys properties (1) - (4), which commutes with
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(**) $C^1_b(H) = \{ v \in C^1(H), \forall v \text{ bounded on } H \}; C^1_{b,1}(H) = \{ v \in C^1_b(H), \forall v \text{ Lipschitz on } H \}$.  
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translations, preserves order ... We have in fact explicit formula for the approximations $u_\varepsilon$: indeed, we prove in section I below that

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{H}} \inf_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \left[ u(y) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |z-y|^2 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |z-x|^2 \right]$$

as well as

$$\overline{u}_\varepsilon(x) = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \left[ u(y) - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |z-y|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |z-x|^2 \right]$$

are elements of $C^{1,1}_0$, that they satisfy (1) - (4) and in addition

(5) \hspace{1cm} u_\varepsilon < u < \overline{u}_\varepsilon \text{ on } \mathcal{H}.

and $\overline{u}_\varepsilon$, $u_\varepsilon$ converge uniformly on $\mathcal{H}$ to $u$.

There might exist other regularization methods valid in infinite dimensions (satisfying (1) - (4) for instance) but we are not aware of any (in particular as explicit as the above formula). Let us mention that the main difference with convolution type regularizations (in finite dimensions) consists in the nonlinearity of the above method.

At this stage, we would like to make a few remarks on $u_\varepsilon$, $\overline{u}_\varepsilon$ and in particular we wish to pinpoint the relations with Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Indeed, consider the following equations

(6) \hspace{1cm} \frac{3u}{3t} + \frac{1}{2} |Vu|^2 = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{H} \times [0,+\infty), \left. u \right|_{t=0} = v \text{ in } \mathcal{H}

resp.(7) \hspace{1cm} \frac{3u}{3t} - \frac{1}{2} |Vu|^2 = 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{H} \times [0,+\infty), \left. u \right|_{t=0} = v \text{ in } \mathcal{H} ;

where $\mathcal{H}$ is, to simplify, finite dimensional and $v \in \text{BUC}(\mathcal{H})$. Observe that, formally, (7) is obtained from (6) by "reversing time". Then, it is known that the "right solutions" of (6) (resp. (7)) namely the viscosity solutions introduced by M. G. Crandall and P. L. Lions [3] - see also for further properties M. G. Crandall, L. C. Evans and P. L. Lions [2] - are given by the Lax-Oleinik formula:

(8) \hspace{1cm} u(x,t) = \inf_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ v(y) + \frac{1}{2t} |x-y|^2 \right\}
(resp. (9) \[ u(x,t) = \sup_{y \in H} \{ v(y) - \frac{1}{2t} |x-y|^2 \} \],

and these solutions form a semigroup that we denote by \( S_p(t) \) (resp. \( S_p(t) \)) where \( F(p) = \frac{1}{2} |p|^2 \); for a proof of these facts we refer to P. L. Lions [6].

We observe next that the proposed regularized functions are nothing but:

\[ u_\epsilon = S_p(\frac{\epsilon}{2}) S_p(\epsilon) u, \quad \overline{u_\epsilon} = S_p(\frac{\epsilon}{2}) S_{p}(\epsilon) u. \]

In fact, as we will see later on, we could as well introduce some two-parameters approximation of \( u \) namely

\[ u_{\epsilon, \delta} = S_p(\delta) S_p(\epsilon) u, \quad \overline{u_{\epsilon, \delta}} = S_p(\delta) S_{p}(\epsilon) u, \]

choosing \( 0 < \delta < \epsilon \).

Let us emphasize that (7) corresponds only formally to a time reversal of (6) and that in general (because shocks are forming and entropy increases) \( S_p(\delta) S_p(\epsilon) u \) does not coincide with \( S_p(\epsilon-\delta) u \). This is the case essentially only when \( u \) is smooth, say \( C_b^{1,1}(H) \), in which case we do have for \( \epsilon \) small enough:

\[ u_{\epsilon, \delta} = S_p(\epsilon-\delta) u, \quad \overline{u_{\epsilon, \delta}} = S_{p}(\epsilon-\delta) u \]

and thus \( u_{\epsilon, \delta}, \overline{u_{\epsilon, \delta}} + u \) as \( \delta + \epsilon \).

The reason for the regularity of \( u_{\epsilon, \delta} \), \( \overline{u_{\epsilon, \delta}} \) (or \( \overline{u_{\epsilon, \delta}} \)) is the following: if \( v \in C_b(H) \) then \( S_p(t)v \) (resp. \( S_p(t)v \)) is for \( t > 0 \) in \( W^{1,\infty}(H) \) and semi-concave (resp. semi-convex) and more precisely we have

\[ S_p(t)v - \frac{1}{2t} |x-x_0|^2 \]

(resp. \( S_p v + \frac{1}{2t} |x-x_0|^2 \)) is concave for all \( x_0 \in H \). Such results first considered in P. L. Lions [6] are elementary observations that we recall in section II below. Hence, \( u_{\epsilon, \delta} \) (for instance) is for any \( \delta > 0 \) semi-convex but in addition since \( S_p(\epsilon) u \) is semi-concave for all \( \epsilon > 0 \) with "second derivatives" bounded by \( 1/\epsilon \) it is not difficult to check on the characteristics (at least formally) that for \( \delta < \epsilon \), \( S_p(\delta)[S_p(\epsilon)u] \) is still semi-concave. And this yields the \( C_b^{1,1} \) regularity! This second step has already been observed in I. Ekeland and J. M. Lasry [5]. Let us also mention
that if \( v \) is convex, then \( S_p(t)v \) is nothing else than the Yosida approximation of \( v \) (of order \( t \)) and it is well-known that
\[ S_p(t)v \in C^1_b(H). \]

We conclude this introduction by mentioning that our motivation for the regularization problem comes from the study of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensional spaces which is being developed by Barbu and Da Prato [1], M. G. Crandall and P. L. Lions [4] and that the above explicit regularization ideas are being applied in [4].

Let us finally mention that everywhere below we identify \( H \) with its dual.

I. Main properties of the regularizations

Let \( u \in UC(H) \) i.e. assume there exists \( m \) continuous, nondecreasing on \([0,\infty[\) such that: \( m(0) = 0 \), \( m(t+s) \leq m(t) + m(s) \) for \( s, t \geq 0 \) and
\[
(10) \quad |u(x) - u(y)| \leq m(|x-y|), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in H.
\]

We consider for \( 0 < \delta < \epsilon, x \in H \)
\[
\begin{align*}
\underline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} &= S_{\delta} S_{\epsilon} u = \sup_{y \in H} \inf_{z \in H} [u(y) + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} |z-y|^2 - \frac{1}{\delta} |z-x|^2] \\
\overline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} &= S_{\epsilon} S_{\delta} u = \inf_{z \in H} \sup_{y \in H} [u(y) - \frac{1}{2\epsilon} |z-y|^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} |z-x|^2].
\end{align*}
\]

**Theorem:** The functions \( \underline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta}, \overline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} \) belong to \( C^1_b(H). \) Let \( t_{\epsilon} \) be the maximum positive root of:
\[ t_{\epsilon}^2 = 2\epsilon m(t_{\epsilon}), \quad \text{so that } t_{\epsilon} \epsilon^{-1/2} \to 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \to 0. \]

We have the following inequalities:
\[
(11) \quad -\infty < \inf_{H} u \leq \underline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} \leq u \leq \overline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} \leq \sup_{H} u = \infty \quad \text{on } H; \\
(12) \quad \sup_{H} |\underline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} - u| \leq m(t_{\epsilon}); \quad \sup_{H} |\overline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} - u| \leq m(t_{\epsilon}); \\
(13) \quad |\underline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta}(x) - \underline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta}(y)| \leq m(|x-y|), \quad |\overline{u}_{\epsilon, \delta} - u| \leq m(t_{\epsilon} t_{\delta}) + \frac{t_{\delta}^2}{2\epsilon}.
\]
\begin{align}
\sup_{H} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}| &< \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, \quad \sup_{H} |\overline{\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, \\
|\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}(x) - \overline{\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}}(y)| &< C_{\varepsilon, \delta}|x-y|, \quad |\overline{\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}}(x) - \overline{\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}}(y)| < C_{\varepsilon, \delta}|x-y| \end{align}

for all \( x, y \in H \), where \( C_{\varepsilon, \delta} = \text{Max}(\delta^{-1}, (\varepsilon-\delta)^{-1}) \).

\textbf{Remarks:}

i) If \( u \in C^{1,1}(H) \), \( \nabla u \in W^{1,\infty}(H) \), then \( u_{\varepsilon, \delta} = S_{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon-\delta)u \) for \( \varepsilon \) small enough (while \( \overline{u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} = S_{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon-\delta)u \) and \( \overline{\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \) remains uniformly bounded in \( W^{1,\infty}(H) \) for \( \varepsilon \) small enough.

ii) Clearly, the regularizations commute with translations and they preserve order (if \( u < v \) on \( H \), then \( u_{\varepsilon, \delta} < v_{\varepsilon, \delta} \), \( \overline{u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} < \overline{v_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \)).

iii) If \( u \in C_{b}(H) \), then \( u_{\varepsilon, \delta}, \overline{u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \in C^{1,1}_{b}(H) \) and they converge to \( u \) pointwise in \( H \) as \( \varepsilon, \delta \to 0 \). More generally, if \( u \in C(H) \) and satisfies
\begin{equation}
|u(x)| < C(1 + |x|^{2}) \text{ on } H
\end{equation}
then for \( \varepsilon \) small enough (and \( 0 < \delta < \varepsilon \)) \( u_{\varepsilon, \delta}, \overline{u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \in C^{1,1}(H) \), they converge pointwise to \( u \) as \( \varepsilon, \delta \to 0 \), and \( \overline{\nabla u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \) may be bounded together with its Lipschitz modulus on balls by constants depending only on the growth of \( u \) on balls \( \ldots \). In addition if \( u \) is uniformly continuous on balls \( \overline{B_{R}} \), one checks easily that \( u_{\varepsilon, \delta}, \overline{u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \) converge uniformly on balls to \( u \).

iv) If one is only interested in regularizing functions in \( UC(H) \) into Lipschitz functions, it is enough to consider:
\begin{equation}
u_{\varepsilon}(x) = \inf_{y \in H} \left[ u(y) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |x-y|^{p}\right]
\end{equation}
for any \( p > 1 \) (if \( p = 1 \), one has to take \( \varepsilon \) small enough) - and one may replace \( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} |x|^{p} \) by \( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \phi(|x|) \) for a general \( \phi \) even, convex, \( \phi(0) = 0 \) and \( \phi \to +\infty \) as \( t \to +\infty \). In addition, let us mention that this regularization works in an arbitrary Banach space (or even metric spaces, take \( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} d(x,y) \)).

v) Let us finally mention a few additional properties of the above regularization: first of all, if \( u \) is convex (resp. concave) then \( u_{\varepsilon, \delta}, \overline{u_{\varepsilon, \delta}} \) are also convex (resp. concave). Indeed we just have to prove that if
u is convex then $S_{F}(\varepsilon)u$ is convex. But observing that $u(y) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |x-y|^2$ is jointly convex in $(x,y)$, and using the lemma in section II, we see that $S_{F}(\varepsilon)u$ is convex. The second property we wish to mention concerns subsolution of convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations: let $F \in C(H)$ be convex, let $f \in UC(H)$, let $u \in UC(H)$ be a viscosity subsolution (see [4] for the precise definition) of

$$F(\nabla u) < f(x) \text{ in } H.$$ 

Then it is possible to show that $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, $\overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ satisfy

$$F(\nabla v) < f(x) + u(\varepsilon,\delta) \text{ in } H$$

where $u(\varepsilon,\delta) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon,\delta \to 0_+$. 

vi) We would like to mention that if $\varepsilon > \varepsilon' > \delta > \delta > 0$ then one checks easily that

$$u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \leq u_{\varepsilon',\delta} \leq u \leq \overline{u}_{\varepsilon',\delta} \leq \overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}.$$ 

Another inequality is obtained by remarking that we have

$$u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) \leq \inf_{y \in H} \sup_{z \in H} [u(y) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |y-z|^2 - \frac{1}{2\delta} |z-x|^2] = \inf_{y \in H} [u(y) + \frac{1}{2(\varepsilon-\delta)} |y-x|^2] = S_{F}(\varepsilon-\delta)u(x)$$

while $\overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta} \geq S_{-F}(\varepsilon-\delta)u$ on $H$. 

vii) Another property of the Inf-Sup convolutions $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, $\overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ concerns critical points. Indeed, first of all, these regularizations preserve the symmetries of $u$: for instance, if $u$ is even on $H$ than $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, $\overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$ are also even. More generally, if $u$ is invariant by a group of isometries of $H$, so are $u_{\varepsilon,\delta}$, $\overline{u}_{\varepsilon,\delta}$. This fact is interesting in itself but also fundamental for critical point theory. Next, we remark that $S_{F}(t)$ (for $t$ small) preserves the critical points of $u$ at least if $u \in C^{1,1}$. 
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Finally, it was observed in I. Ekeland and J. M. Lasry [5] that if \( u \) is semi-convex and satisfies (P.S.) condition then for \( t \) small \( v = S_{-F}(t)u \) is \( C^{1,1} \) and also satisfies (P.S.). Furthermore, \( Vv \) may be used as a pseudo-gradient for \( u \). Applications to critical point theorems are given in [5] (see also A. Pommellet [7] for related considerations).

We conjecture that if \( u \) is Lipschitz (to simplify) and satisfies (P.S.) (with Clarke gradient), then \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \) also satisfy (P.S.). This would enable one to do critical point theory for nonsmooth functions via this regularization.

viii) The last property (1) of the inf-sup convolutions we wish to mention concerns the possibility of extending and regularizing a function \( u \) uniformly continuous on a subset \( K \) of \( H \): indeed, consider

\[
    u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x) = \sup_{x \in H} \inf_{y \in K} [u(y) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |y - z|^2 - \frac{1}{2\delta} |z - x|^2]
\]

then \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in C^{1,1}(H) \), \( u > u_{\varepsilon,\delta} > u - m(t \varepsilon) \) on \( K \), \( |u_{\varepsilon,\delta}(x)| \leq \frac{t \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \) on \( H \).

II. Proofs.

We first show the string of inequalities in (11): the first one is deduced from the inequality \( u > \inf_u \), while the second one comes from the choice \( y = x \) in the definition of \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \). The other inequalities are proved similarly.

Next, we observe that the explicit formula yield the fact that if \( u \) satisfies (10), then \( S_{-F}(t)u \) also satisfies (10) for all \( t > 0 \), thus proving (13).

We next remark that if \( u \) satisfies (10), then the infimum defining \( S_{-F}(\lambda)u(x) \) (resp. the supremum defining \( S_{-F}(\lambda)u(x) \)) for \( \lambda > 0 \) may be restricted to points \( y \) satisfying
Indeed, consider for example $S \epsilon F(t)u(x)$, since $S \epsilon F(t)u < u$ we may restrict the infimum to points $y$ such that

$$u(y) + \frac{1}{2t} |x-y|^2 < u(x)$$

and using (10) we deduce (16). And, since $S \epsilon F(\epsilon)u < \frac{u_{\epsilon, \delta}}{\epsilon} < u$, (16) implies:

$$u_{\epsilon, \delta} > u_{\epsilon}(t_{\epsilon})$$

and (12) is proved. Notice also that (16) easily yields that if $u$ satisfies (10), then $S \epsilon F(\lambda)u$ is Lipschitz for $\lambda > 0$ and

$$|S \epsilon F(\lambda)u(x) - S \epsilon F(\lambda)u(y)| \leq \frac{t_{\lambda}}{\lambda} |x-y|, \forall x, y.$$ 

Recalling that $S \epsilon F(t)$ preserves moduli of continuity for $t > 0$, we deduce that $u_{\epsilon, \delta}$, $\frac{u_{\epsilon, \delta}}{\epsilon}$ are Lipschitz with $\frac{t_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon}$ as Lipschitz constant. This proves (14) (in a weak form at least).

It remains to show that $u_{\epsilon, \delta}$, $\frac{u_{\epsilon, \delta}}{\epsilon}$ $\in C^1,1(H)$ and that (15) holds: we will prove these claims for $u_{\epsilon, \delta}$, the proof being identical for $\frac{u_{\epsilon, \delta}}{\epsilon}$. We first recall (from [5] for example) that if $u \in UC(H)$ $S \epsilon F(t)u = v$ (resp. $S^- \epsilon F(t)u$) is semi-concave (resp. semi-convex) and more precisely that we have

$$v - \frac{1}{2t} |x|^2$$

is concave on $H$ (resp. $v + \frac{1}{2t} |x|^2$ is convex on $H$).

Indeed for each $y \in H$, the function

$$u(y) + \frac{1}{2t} |x-y|^2 - \frac{1}{2t} |x|^2$$

is affine in $x$ and thus

$$v - \frac{1}{2t} |x|^2 = \inf_{y \in H} [u(y) + \frac{1}{2t} |x-y|^2 - \frac{1}{2t} |x|^2]$$

is concave on $H$. Hence, $u_{\epsilon, \delta}$, $\frac{u_{\epsilon, \delta}}{\epsilon}$ satisfy

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\frac{u_{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} - \frac{1}{2t} |x|^2 \text{ is concave on } H \\
\frac{u_{\epsilon, \delta}}{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2t} |x|^2 \text{ is convex on } H.
\end{array} \right.$$ 

(17')

We next want to show that $u_{\epsilon, \delta} = \frac{1}{2(\epsilon-\delta)} |x|^2$ is concave on $H$ and this will again be a general property of $S^- \epsilon F(t)$. Indeed, let $u \in UC(H)$ satisfy
\[ u - \frac{1}{2\lambda} |x|^2 \] is concave on \( H \)

for some \( \lambda > 0 \), then for \( 0 < t < \lambda \) \( v = S_\lambda(t)u \) satisfies

\[ u - \frac{1}{2(\lambda-t)} |x|^2 \] is concave on \( H \).

This claim follows from the equality:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u(x) - \frac{1}{2(\lambda-t)} |x|^2 &= \sup_{y \in H} \left( u(y) - \frac{1}{2\lambda} |y|^2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda} |y|^2 - \frac{1}{2t} |x-y|^2 - \frac{1}{2(\lambda-t)} |x|^2 \right) \\
    &= \sup_{y \in H} \left( \varphi(x,y) \right)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \varphi(x,y) \) is as it is easily checked - concave with respect to \( (x,y) \).

We conclude applying the elementary

**Lemma:** Let \( \varphi \) be jointly concave in \( (x,y) \) on \( H \times H \) and let \( \psi(x) = \sup_{y \in H} \varphi(x,y) < \infty \), then \( \psi \) is concave on \( H \).

Indeed, let \( x_1, x_2 \in H \), let \( \varepsilon > 0 \), choose \( y_1, y_2 \) in \( H \) such that

\[ \psi(x_1) < \varphi(x_1, y_1) + \varepsilon, \psi(x_2) < \varphi(x_2, y_2) + \varepsilon \]

then for \( \theta \in [0,1] \)

\[
\psi(\theta x_1 + (1-\theta)x_2) > \varphi(\theta x_1 + (1-\theta)x_2, \theta y_1 + (1-\theta)y_2) \\
> \theta \varphi(x_1, y_1) + (1-\theta)\varphi(x_2, y_2) \\
> \theta \psi(x_1) + (1-\theta)\psi(x_2) - \varepsilon
\]

(the first inequality comes from the definition of \( \psi \), the second from the joint concavity of \( \varphi \) and the third from the choices of \( y_1, y_2 \)). We conclude sending \( \varepsilon \) to 0.

In conclusion, we have proved that \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \) satisfies \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} + \frac{1}{2} \delta \epsilon \delta \) \( |x|^2 \) is convex, \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} - \frac{1}{2} \delta \epsilon \delta \) \( |x|^2 \) is concave. This yields that \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in C^1(H) \) and we wish to show that this implies in fact \( u_{\varepsilon,\delta} \in C^1,1(H) \) and that (15) holds. This is well-known in finite dimensions but it seems to require a justification in general. Denote by \( v = u_{\varepsilon,\delta}, C = \delta \epsilon \delta \), let \( x,y,\xi \in H \) and...
consider $H_1$, the vector space spanned by $x,y,e$. The restriction $v_1$ of $v$ to $H_1$ still satisfies the semi-concavity and semi-convexity properties of $v$ with the same constant $C$. Hence $v_1 \in C^{1,1}(H_1)$ and

$$|\nabla v_1(x) - \nabla v_1(y)| \leq C|x-y|$$

But $\nabla v_1(x) = P_1 \nabla v(x)$, $\nabla v_1(y) = P_1 \nabla v(y)$ where $P_1$ is the orthogonal projection onto $H_1$ and thus

$$|(\nabla v(x) - \nabla v(y), f)| \leq C|x-y| |f|.$$

Since $f$ is arbitrary, we conclude. \[\square\]
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