# A note on *h*-convex functions

Mohammad W. Alomari

Communicated by Sergey Astashkin

**Abstract.** In this work, we discuss the continuity of h-convex functions by introducing the concepts of h-convex curves (h-cord). Geometric interpretation of h-convexity is given. The fact that for a h-continuous function f, is being h-convex if and only if is h-midconvex is proved. Generally, we prove that if f is h-convex then f is h-continuous. A discussion regarding derivative characterization of h-convexity is also proposed.

Keywords. h-Convex function, Hölder continuous.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 26A15, 26A16, 26A51.

## 1 Introduction

Let I be a real interval. A function  $f: I \to \mathbb{R}$  is called convex iff

$$f(t\alpha + (1-t)\beta) \le tf(\alpha) + (1-t)f(\beta), \qquad (1)$$

for all points  $\alpha, \beta \in I$  and all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . If -f is convex then we say that f is concave. Moreover, if f is both convex and concave, then f is said to be affine.

In 1979, Breckner [3] introduced the class of *s*-convex functions (in the second sense), as follows:

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $I \subseteq [0,\infty)$  and  $s \in (0,1]$ , a function  $f : I \to [0,\infty)$  is *s*-convex function or that *f* belongs to the class  $K_s^2(I)$  if for all  $x, y \in I$  and  $t \in [0,1]$  we have

$$f(tx + (1 - t)y) \le t^{s} f(x) + (1 - t)^{s} f(y).$$
(2)

In the last years, among others, the notion of *s*-convex functions is discriminated and starred. In literature a few papers devoted to study this type of convexity. The building theories of *s*-convexity as geometric and analytic tools are still under consideration, development and examine. Due to Hudzik and Maligranda (1994) [15], two senses of *s*-convexity ( $0 < s \le 1$ ) of real-valued functions are known in the literature, and given below. **Definition 1.2.** A function  $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ , is said to be *s*-convex in the first sense if

$$f(\alpha x + \beta y) \le \alpha^{s} f(x) + \beta^{s} f(y) \tag{3}$$

for all  $x, y \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \ge 0$  with  $\alpha^s + \beta^s = 1$  and for some fixed  $s \in (0, 1]$ . This class of functions is denoted by  $K_s^1$ .

This definition of *s*-convexity, for so called  $\varphi$ -functions, was introduced by Orlicz in 1961 and was used in the theory of Orlicz spaces. A function  $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be a  $\varphi$ -function if f(0) = 0 and f is nondecreasing and continuous. The symbol  $\varphi$  stands for an Orlicz function, i.e.,  $\varphi$  is defined on the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ with values in  $[0, +\infty]$  and is convex, even, vanishing and continuous at zero. For further details see [15, 17, 18, 32].

**Remark 1.3.** We note that, it can be easily seen that for s = 1, s-convexity (in both senses) reduces to the ordinary convexity of functions defined on  $[0, \infty)$ .

In general, a real-valued function f defined on an open convex subset C of a linear space is called Breckner *s*-convex if (2) holds for every  $x, y \in C$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in [0,1]$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ , where  $s \in (0,1)$  is fixed. More preciously, Breckner considered an open convex subset  $\mathbb{M}$  of a linear space  $\mathbb{L}$  and defined  $f : \mathbb{M} \subseteq \mathbb{L} \to \mathbb{R}$ , to be *s*-convex if (2) holds, for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{M}, \alpha, \beta \in [0,1]$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ , where  $s \in (0,1)$  is fixed. Also, Breckner considered a special case of *s*-convex functions which is so called rational *s*-convex, that is for all rational  $\alpha, \beta \in [0,1]$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$  and points  $x, y \in \mathbb{M}$ , the inequality (2) holds. Furthermore, Breckner proved that for locally bounded above *s*-convex functions defined on open subsets of linear topological spaces are continuous and nonnegative.

In 1978, Breckner and Orbán [4] studied functions defined on a convex subset of complex Hausdorff topological linear space of dimension greater than 1 into an ordered topological linear space such that all its order–bounded subsets are bounded, and proved that Breckner *s*-convex functions with  $s \in (0, 1]$  are continuous on the interior of their domain.

In 1994, Breckner [5] (see also [6]) proved that for a rationally *s*-convex function continuity and local *s*-Hölder continuity are equivalent at each interior point of the domain of definition of the function. Furthermore, it is shown that a rationally *s*-convex function which is bounded on a nonempty open convex set is *s*-Hölder continuous on every compact subset of this set. Indeed, Breckner [4], showed that if a real-valued function defined on a convex subset of a linear space endowed with topology generated by a direct pseudonorm is continuous and rationally Breckner *s*-convex for an  $s \in (0, 1]$ , then it is locally *s*-Hölder.

In 1994, Hudzik and Maligranda [15], realized the importance and undertook a systematic study of *s*-convex functions in both senses. They compared the notion of Breckner *s*-convexity with a similar one of [18]. A function *f* is Orlicz *s*-convex if the inequality (3) is satisfied for all  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  such that  $\alpha^s + \beta^s = 1$ . Hudzik and Maligranda, among others, gave an example of a non-continuous Orlicz *s*-convex function, which is not Breckner *s*-convex.

In 2001, Pycia [24] established a direct proof of Breckner's result that Breckner *s*-convex real-valued functions on finite dimensional normed spaces are locally *s*-Hölder. The same result was proved in [1] where different context was considered. For the same result regarding convexity see [7,8].

In the 2008, Pinheiro [25] studied the class of  $K_s^1$  of *s*-convex functions and explained why the first *s*-convexity sense was abandoned by the literature in the field. In fact, Pinheiro , proposed some criticisms to the current way of presenting the definition of *s*-convex functions. We may summarize Pinheiro criticisms in the following points:

- (i) What is the 'true' difference between convex and s-convex in both senses.
- (ii) So far, Pinheiro did not find references, in the literature, to the geometry of an *s*-convex function, what, once more, makes it less clear to understand the difference between an *s*-convex and a convex function whilst there are clear references to the geometry of the convex functions.

In the same paper [25], Pinheiro revised the class of s-convexity in the first sense. In [26], Pinheiro proposed a geometric interpretation for this type of functions.

**Definition 1.4.** Let U be any subset of  $[0, \infty)$ . A function  $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ , is said to be s-convex in the first sense if

$$f\left(\lambda x + (1-\lambda^s)^{1/s}y\right) \le \lambda^s f\left(x\right) + (1-\lambda^s)f\left(y\right) \tag{4}$$

for all  $x, y \in U$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .

The presented reason from Pinheiro to why s-convexity in the first sense got abandoned in the literature, is that, if one takes  $x = y = \frac{1}{4}$  with  $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\beta = 1$ for example, one gets that  $\alpha x + \beta y = 0.125 + 0.25 = 0.375$ . So that, if  $s = \frac{1}{2}$ , then the value of  $\alpha x + \beta y$  would lie outside of the interval [x, y], on the contrary of this, the value of  $\alpha x + \beta y$  would lie inside of the interval [x, y] in case of convexity. With this the first sense of s-convexity becomes a close to the meaning of convexity and so the geometric explanation of s-convex function is easy to be compared with the geometry of convex function if some further restrictions are imposed to it.

The proposed geometric description for *s*-convex curve in the first sense stated by Pinheiro [25–30] as follows:

**Definition 1.5.** A function  $f : X \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$  is called *s*-convex in the first sense if and only if one in two situations occur:

0 < s<sub>1</sub> < 1, f then belonging to K<sup>1</sup><sub>s</sub>, for 0 < s ≤ s<sub>1</sub>: The graph of f lies below (L), which is a convex curve between any two domain points with minimum distance of (2<sup>-1</sup> - 2<sup>-1/s</sup>) (domain points distance), that is, for every compact interval J ⊂ I, where length of J is greater than, or equal to (2<sup>-1</sup> - 2<sup>-1/s</sup>) interval with boundary ∂J, it is true that

$$\sup_J \left(L-f\right) \geq \sup_{\partial J} \left(L-f\right)$$

and L is such that it is continuous, smooth, and, for each point x of L, defined in terms of ninety degrees intercepts with the straight line between the two points of the function, it is true that  $1 \le x \le 2^{-1} + 2^{-s}$ , where 1 corresponds to the straight line height;

• f is convex.

In general, the class of *s*-convex functions in the second sense would incomplete concept without a geometric interpretations for it is behavior. Recently, Pinheiro devoted her efforts to give a clear geometric definition for *s*-convexity in second sense. In [27] Pinheiro successfully proposed a geometric description for *s*-convex curve, as follows:

**Definition 1.6.** f is called *s*-convex in the second sense if and only if one in two situations occur:

•  $0 < s_1 < 1$ , f then belonging to  $K_s^2$ , for  $0 < s \le s_1$ : The graph of f lies below (L), which is a convex curve between any two domain points with minimum distance of  $(2^{-s} - 2^{-1})$  (domain points distance), that is, for every compact interval  $J \subset I$ , where length of J is greater than, or equal to  $(2^{-s} - 2^{-1})$  interval with boundary  $\partial J$ , it is true that

$$\sup_{J} \left( L - f \right) \ge \sup_{\partial J} \left( L - f \right)$$

and L is such that it is continuous, smooth, and, for each point x of L, defined in terms of ninety degrees intercepts with the straight line between the two points of the function, it is true that  $1 \le x \le 2^{1-s}$ , where 1 corresponds to the straight line height;

• f is convex.

More geometrically, an interpretation of *s*-convex functions is introduced as follows:

**Definition 1.7.** f is called *s*-convex, 0 < s < 1,  $f \ge 0$ , if the graph of f lies below a 'bent chord' L between any two points. That is, for every compact interval  $J \subset I$ , with boundary  $\partial J$ , it is true that

$$\sup_{J} \left( L - f \right) \ge \sup_{\partial J} \left( L - f \right).$$

Indeed the geometric view for *s*-convex mapping of second sense is going through which Pinheiro called it *'limiting curve'*, which is going to distinguish curves that are *s*-convex of second sense from those that are not. After that, Pinheiro obtained how the choice of 's' affects the limiting curve. In general a 'limiting curve' may be described by a *bent chord* joining f(x) to f(y)-corresponding to the verification of the *s*-convexity property of the function *f* in the interval [x, y]-forms representing the limiting height for the curve *f* to be at, limit included, in case *f* is *s*-convex. This curve is represented by  $\lambda^s f(x) + (1 - \lambda)^s f(y)$ , for each 0 < s < 1.

Some properties of the limiting curve such as: maximum height, length, and local inclination are considered in [26–29].

- Height. The maximum of the limiting s-curve is  $2^{1-s}$ .
- Length. Let  $f(\lambda) = \lambda^s X + (1 \lambda)^s Y$ , with X = f(x), and Y = f(y). The size of the limiting curve from f(x) to f(y) is

$$L\left(\lambda\right) = \int_{0}^{1} \sqrt{1 + s^{2}\lambda^{2s-2} + s^{2}\left(1 - \lambda\right)^{2s-2} - 2s^{2}\lambda^{s-1}\left(1 - \lambda\right)^{s-1}} d\lambda$$

which shows that how bent is the limiting curve.

• Local inclination. The local inclination of the limiting curve may be founded by means of the first derivative, consider  $f(\lambda) = \lambda^s f(x) + (1 - \lambda)^s f(y)$ , Therefore, the inclination is  $f'(\lambda) = s\lambda^{s-1}f(x) - s(1 - \lambda)^{s-1}f(y)$  and varies accordingly to the value of  $\lambda$ .

In 1985, E. K. Godunova and V. I. Levin (see [13] or [20, pp. 410-433]) introduced the following class of functions: **Definition 1.8.** We say that  $f : I \to \mathbb{R}$  is a Godunova-Levin function or that f belongs to the class Q(I) if for all  $x, y \in I$  and  $t \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$f(tx + (1 - t)y) \le \frac{f(x)}{t} + \frac{f(y)}{1 - t}.$$

In the same work, the authors proved that all nonnegative monotonic and nonnegative convex functions belong to this class. For related works see [12, 19].

In 1999, Pearce and Rubinov [23], established a new type of convex functions which is called *P*-functions.

**Definition 1.9.** We say that  $f : I \to \mathbb{R}$  is *P*-function or that *f* belongs to the class P(I) if for all  $x, y \in I$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$  we have

$$f(tx + (1 - t)y) \le f(x) + f(y).$$

Indeed,  $Q(I) \supseteq P(I)$  and for applications it is important to note that P(I) also consists only of nonnegative monotonic, convex and quasi-convex functions. A related work was considered in [12, 34].

In 2007, Varošanec [35] introduced the class of *h*-convex functions which generalize convex, *s*-convex, Godunova-Levin functions and *P*-functions. Namely, the *h*-convex function is defined as a non-negative function  $f : I \to \mathbb{R}$  which satisfies

$$f(t\alpha + (1-t)\beta) \le h(t)f(\alpha) + h(1-t)f(\beta),$$
(5)

where h is a non-negative function,  $t \in (0,1) \subseteq J$  and  $x, y \in I$ , where I and J are real intervals such that  $(0,1) \subseteq J$ . Accordingly, some properties of h-convex functions were discussed in the same work of Varošanec. For more results; generalization, counterparts and inequalities regarding h-convexity see [2, 9–11, 14, 16, 22].

### 2 On *h*-convex functions

Throughout this work, I and J are two intervals subset of  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $(0, 1) \subseteq J$  and  $[a, b] \subseteq I$  with 0 < a < b.

**Definition 2.1.** The *h*-cord joining any two points (x, f(x)) and (y, f(y)) on the graph of *f* is defined to be

$$L(t;h) := [f(y) - f(x)]h\left(\frac{t-x}{y-x}\right) + f(x),$$
(6)

for all  $t \in [x, y] \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ . In particular, if h(t) = t then we obtain the well known form of chord, which is

$$L\left(t;t
ight):=rac{f\left(y
ight)-f\left(x
ight)}{y-x}\left(t-x
ight)+f\left(x
ight).$$

It's worth to mention that, if h(0) = 0 and h(1) = 1, then L(x;h) = f(x)and L(y;h) = f(y), so that the *h*-cord *L* agrees with *f* at endpoints *x*, *y*, and this true for all such  $x, y \in I$ .

The *h*-convexity of a function  $f : I \to \mathbb{R}$  means geometrically that the points of the graph of *f* are on or below the *h*-chord joining the endpoints (x, f(x)) and (y, f(y)) for all  $x, y \in I, x < y$ . In symbols, we write

$$f(t) \le [f(y) - f(x)]h\left(\frac{t-x}{y-x}\right) + f(x) = L(t;h),$$

for any  $x \leq t \leq y$  and  $x, y \in I$ .



Figure 1. The graph of  $h_k(t) = t^k$ ,  $k = \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}$  (green, black, blue), respectively, and  $f(t) = t^2$  (red),  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Hence, (5) means geometrically that for a given three non-collinear points P, Qand R on the graph of f with Q between P and R (say P < Q < R). Let h is super(sub)multiplicative and  $h(\alpha) \ge (\le) \alpha$ , for  $\alpha \in (0, 1) \subset J$ . A function f is h-convex (concave) if Q is on or below (above) the h-chord  $\widehat{PR}$  (see Figure 1). **Caution:** In special case, for  $h_k(t) = t^k$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$  the proposed geometric interpretation is valid for  $k \in (-1, 0) \cup (0, \infty)$ . In the case that  $k \leq -1$  or k = 0 the geometric meaning is inconclusive so we exclude this case (and (and similar cases) from our proposal above.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $h : J \to (0, \infty)$  be a non-negative function. Let  $f : I \to \mathbb{R}$  be any function. We say f is h-midconvex (h-midconcave) if

$$f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \le (\ge) h\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) [f(x) + f(y)]$$

for all  $x, y \in I$ .

In particular, f is locally h-midocnvex if and only if

$$h\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)[f(x+p) + f(x-p)] - f(x) \ge 0,$$

for all  $x \in (x - p, x + p), p > 0$ .

A generalization of Jensen characterization of convex functions could be stated as follows:

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $h: J \to (0, \infty)$  be a non-negative function such that  $h(\alpha) \ge \alpha$ , for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $f: I \to \mathbb{R}_+$  be a nonnegative continuous function. f is h-convex if and only if it is h-midconvex; i.e., the inequality

$$f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \le h\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \left[f\left(x\right) + f\left(y\right)\right],$$

holds for all  $x, y \in I$ .

*Proof.* The first direction follows directly by definition of h-convexity. To prove the second direction, suppose on the contrary that f is not h-convex. Then, there exists a subinterval [x, y] such that the graph of f is not under the chord joining (x, f(x)) and (y, f(y)); that is,

$$f(t) \ge [f(y) - f(x)]h\left(\frac{t-x}{y-x}\right) + f(x) = L(t;h),$$

for all such  $x, y \in I \cap J$ . In other words, the function

$$g(t) = f(t) - [f(y) - f(x)]h\left(\frac{t-x}{y-x}\right) - f(x), \qquad t \in I$$

satisfies  $M = \sup \{g(t) : t \in [x, y]\} > 0$ . Since h(0) = 0 and h(1) = 1, then L(x; h) = f(x) and L(y; h) = f(y), so that the *h*-cord *L* agrees with *f* at endpoints *x*, *y*. Thus, *g* is continuous and g(x) = g(y) = 0, direct computation shows that *g* is also mid *h*-convex. Setting  $c = \inf \{t \in [x, y] : g(t) = M\}$ , then necessarily g(c) = M and  $c \in (x, y)$ . By the definition of *c*, for every p > 0 for which  $c \pm p \in (a, b)$ , we have g(c - p) < g(c) and g(c + p) < g(c), so that since  $h(\alpha) \ge \alpha$ , for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$g(c-p) + g(c+p) < 2g(c) = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}g(c) \le \frac{1}{h(\frac{1}{2})}g(c),$$

which contradicts the fact that g is mid h-convex.

**Corollary 2.4.** Let  $h: J \to (0, \infty)$  be a non-negative function such that  $h(\alpha) \leq \alpha$ , for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $f: I \to \mathbb{R}_+$  be a nonnegative continuous function. f is h-concave if and only if it is h-midconcave.

We often need to know how fast limits are converging, and this allows us to control the remainder of a given function in a neighborhood of some point  $x_0$ . So that, we need to extend the concept of continuity. Fortunately, in control theory and numerical analysis, a function  $h : J \subseteq [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is called a control function if

(i) h is nondecreasing,

(ii) 
$$\inf_{\delta>0} h(\delta) = 0$$

A function  $f : I \to \mathbb{R}$  is *h*-continuous at  $x_0$  if  $|f(x) - f(x_0)| \le h(|x - x_0|)$ , for all  $x \in I$ . Furthermore, a function is continuous in  $x_0$  if it is *h*-continuous for some control function *h*.

This approach leads us to refining the notion of continuity by restricting the set of admissible control functions.

For a given set of control functions C a function is C-continuous if it is hcontinuous for all  $h \in C$ . For example the Hölder continuous functions of order  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$  are defined by the set of control functions

$$\mathcal{C}_{H}^{(\alpha)}(h) = \left\{ h | h\left(\delta\right) = H \left|\delta\right|^{\alpha}, H > 0 \right\}.$$

In case  $\alpha = 1$ , the set  $C_{H}^{(1)}(h)$  contains all functions satisfying the Lipschitz condition.

**Theorem 2.5.** Let  $(0, 1) \subseteq J$ ,  $h: J \to (0, \infty)$  be a control function which is super multiplicative such that  $h(\alpha) \ge \alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let I be a real interval,  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  (a < b) with a, b in  $I^{\circ}$  (the interior of I). If  $f: I \to \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative h-convex function on [a, b], then f is h-continuous on [a, b].

*Proof.* Choose  $\epsilon > 0$  be small enough such that  $(a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon) \subseteq I$  and let

$$m_{\epsilon} := \inf \left\{ f\left(x\right), x \in \left(a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon\right) \right\}$$

and

$$M_{\epsilon} := \sup \left\{ f(x), x \in (a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon) \right\},\$$

such that  $h(\epsilon) = M_{\epsilon} - m_{\epsilon}$ . If  $x, y \in [a, b]$ , such that  $x = y + \frac{\epsilon}{|y-x|}(y-x)$  and  $\lambda_{\epsilon} = \frac{|y-x|}{\epsilon+|y-x|}$ . Then for  $z \in [a-\epsilon, b+\epsilon]$ ,  $y = \lambda_{\epsilon}z + (1-\lambda_{\epsilon})x$ , we have

$$f(y) = f(\lambda_{\epsilon}z + (1 - \lambda_{\epsilon})x) \le \lambda_{\epsilon}f(z) + (1 - \lambda_{\epsilon})f(x)$$
  
$$\le \lambda_{\epsilon}[f(z) - f(x)] + f(x) \le h(\lambda_{\epsilon})[f(z) - f(x)] + f(x),$$

which implies that  $y = \lambda_{\epsilon} z + (1 - \lambda_{\epsilon}) x$ , we have

$$f(y) - f(x) \le h(\lambda_{\epsilon}) \left[ f(z) - f(x) \right] \le h(\lambda_{\epsilon}) \left( M_{\epsilon} - m_{\epsilon} \right)$$
$$< h\left( \frac{|y - x|}{\epsilon} \right) \left( M_{\epsilon} - m_{\epsilon} \right)$$
$$< \frac{h(|y - x|)}{h(\epsilon)} \left( M_{\epsilon} - m_{\epsilon} \right)$$
$$= h(|y - x|).$$

Since this is true for any  $x, y \in [a, b]$ , we conclude that

$$|f(y) - f(x)| \le h(|y - x|),$$

which shows that f is h-continuous on [a, b] as desired.

Another Proof. Alternatively, if one replaces the condition  $h(\alpha) + h(1 - \alpha) \le 1$  for each  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  instead of  $h(\alpha) \ge \alpha$  in Theorem 2.5. Then by repeating the same steps in the above proof, we have

$$f(y) = f(\lambda_{\epsilon}z + (1 - \lambda_{\epsilon})x) \le h(\lambda_{\epsilon}) f(z) + h(1 - \lambda_{\epsilon}) f(x)$$
  
$$\le h(\lambda_{\epsilon}) f(z) + [1 - h(\lambda_{\epsilon})] f(x)$$
  
(since  $h(1 - \lambda_{\epsilon}) \le 1 - h(\lambda_{\epsilon})$ )  
$$= h(\lambda_{\epsilon}) [f(z) - f(x)] + f(x),$$

which implies that  $y = \lambda_{\epsilon} z + (1 - \lambda_{\epsilon}) x$ , we have

$$f(y) - f(x) \le h(\lambda_{\epsilon}) [f(z) - f(x)] \le h(\lambda_{\epsilon}) (M_{\epsilon} - m_{\epsilon})$$
  
$$< h\left(\frac{|y-x|}{\epsilon}\right) (M_{\epsilon} - m_{\epsilon})$$
  
$$< \frac{h(|y-x|)}{h(\epsilon)} (M_{\epsilon} - m_{\epsilon})$$
  
$$= h(|y-x|).$$

Since this is true for any  $x, y \in [a, b]$ , we conclude that  $|f(y) - f(x)| \le h(|y - x|)$ , which shows that f is h-continuous on [a, b]. Surely, this is can be considered as an alternative proof of Theorem 2.5.

It's well known that if f is twice differentiable then f is convex if and only if  $f'' \ge 0$ . In a convenient way Pinheiro in [29] proposed that f is an *s*-convex (in the second sense) if and only if  $f'' \ge 1 - 2^{1-s}$ . Indeed, Pinheiro presented a "proof" to her result, however we can say without doubt that she introduced some good thoughts rather than formal mathematical proof. Following the same way in [29] and in viewing the presented discussion in the introduction we conjecture that:

**Conjecture 2.6.** Let  $h: J \to (0, \infty)$  be a non-negative function such that  $h(\alpha) \ge \alpha$ , for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and consider  $f: I \to \mathbb{R}$  be a twice differentiable function. A function f is h-convex if and only if  $f''(x) \ge 1 - 2h(\frac{1}{2})$ .

#### Bibliography

- M. W. Alomari, M. Darus, S. S. Dragomir and U. Kirmaci, On fractional differentiable s-convex functions, *Jordan J. Math and Stat.* 3(1) (2010), 33–42.
- [2] M. Bombardelli and S. Varošanec, Properties of *h*-convex functions related to the Hermite-Hadamard-Fejér inequalities, *Compute. Math. Applica.* 58(9) (2009), 1869– 1877.
- [4] W. W. Breckner and G. Orban, Continuity Properties of Rationally s-convex Mappings with Values in an Ordered Topological Linear Space, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napocoi, 1978.
- [5] W. W. Breckner, Hölder-continuity of certain generalized convex functions, *Optimization* 28 (1994), 201–209.

- [6] W. W. Breckner, Rational s-convexity, a Generalized Jensen-convexity, Cluj University Press, Cluj-Napoca, 2011.
- [7] S. Cobzas and I. Muntean, Continuous and locally Lipschitz convex functions, *Mathematica Rev. d'Anal. Numér. et de Théorie de l'Approx.*, Ser. Mathematica 18(41) (1976), 41–51.
- [8] S. Cobzas, On the Lipschitz properties of continuous convex functions, *Mathematica Ret. d'Anal. Numér. et de Théorie de l'Approx.*, Ser. Mathemarica 21(44) (1979), 123-125.
- [9] M. V. Cortez, Relative strongly *h*-convex functions and integral inequalities, *Appl. Math. Inf. Sci. Lett.* 4(2) (2016), 39–45.
- [10] S. S. Dragomir, Inequalities of Jensen type for *h*-convex functions on linear spaces, *Math. Moravica* **19(1)** (2015), 107–121.
- [11] S. S. Dragomir, Inequalities of Hermite-Hadamard type for *h*-convex functions on linear spaces, *Proyecciones J. Math.* **34(4)**, (2015) 323–341.
- [12] S. S. Dragomir, J. Pečarić and L. E. Persson, Some inequalities of Hadamard type, Soochow J. Math. 21 (1995), 335–341.
- [13] E. K. Godunova and V. I. Levin, Neravenstva dlja funkcii širokogo klassa, soderžaščego vypuklye, monotonnye i nekotorye drugie vidy funkcii, Vyčislitel. Mat. i. Mat. Fiz. Mežvuzov. Sb. Nauk. Trudov, MGPI, Moskva, 1985, pp. 138–142 (in Russian).
- [14] A. Házy, Bernstein-doetsch type results for *h*-convex functions, *Math. Inequal. Appl.* 14(3) (2011), 499–508.
- [15] H. Hudzik and L. Maligranda, Some remarks on s-convex functions, Aequationes Math. 48 (1994), 100–111.
- [16] M. Matłoka, On Hadamard's inequality for *h*-convex function on a disk, *Appl. Math. Comp.* 235 (2014), 118–123.
- [17] J. Musielak, Orlicz Spaces and Modular Spaces, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1983.
- [18] W. Matuszewska and W. Orlicz, A note on the theory of *s*-normed spaces of  $\psi$ -integrable functions, *Studia Math.* **21** (1981), 107–115.
- [19] D. S. Mitrinović and J. Pečarić, Note on a class of functions of Godunova and Levin, C. R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Can. 12 (1990), 33–36.
- [20] D.S. Mitrinović, J. Pečarić and A. M. Fink, *Classical and New Inequalities in Anal*ysis, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1993.
- [21] C. P. Niculescu and L. E. Persson, Convex Functions and Their Applications. A Contemporary Approach, CMS Books Math., Vol. 23, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006.
- [22] A. Olbryś, Representation theorems for *h*-convexity, *J. Math. Anal. Appl* **426(2)** (2015), 986–994.

- [23] C. E. M. Pearce and A. M. Rubinov, *P*-functions, quasi-convex functions and Hadamard-type inequalities, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 240 (1999), 92–104.
- [24] M. Pycia, A direct proof of the s-Hölder continuity of Breckner s-convex functions, Aequationes Math. 61(1-2) (2001), 128–130.
- [25] M. R. Pinheiro, Convexity Secrets, Trafford Publishing, 2008.
- [26] M. R. Pinheiro, Exploring the concept of s-convexity, Aequationes Mathematicae 74(3) (2007), 201–209.
- [27] M. R. Pinheiro, *Hudzik and Maligranda's s-convexity as a local approximation to convex functions*, Preprint, 2008.
- [28] M. R. Pinheiro, *Hudzik and Maligranda's s-convexity as a local approximation to convex functions II*, Preprint, 2008.
- [29] M. R. Pinheiro, *Hudzik and Maligranda's s-convexity as a local approximation to convex functions III*, Preprint, 2008.
- [30] M. R. Pinheiro, H–H Inequality for s-Convex Functions, Inter. J. P. Appl. Math. 44(4) (2008), 563–579.
- [31] A. W. Roberts and D. E. Varberg, *Convex Functions*, Academic Press, New York, 1973.
- [32] S. Rolewicz, *Metric Linear Spaces*, 2nd ed., PWN, Warsaw, 1984.
- [33] T. Trif, Hölder continuity of generalized convex set-valued mappings, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 255 (2001), 44–57.
- [34] K.-L. Tseng, G.-S. Yang and S. S. Dragomir, On quasi convex functions and Hadamard's inequality, *Demonstratio Mathematics* XLI(2) (2008), 323–335.
- [35] S. Varošanec, On h-convexity, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 326 (2007), 303-311.

Received February 6, 2019; revised May 17, 2019; accepted August 4, 2019.

#### Author information

Mohammad W. Alomari, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Information Technology, Irbid National University, 2600 Irbid 21110, Jordan. E-mail: mwomath@gmail.com