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# BEST APPROXIMATION AND STRICT CONVEXITY OF METRIC SPACES 

Tulsi Dass NARANG<br>(Received November 8, 1979)

The notion of strict convexity in metric spaces was introduced in [1] and certain existence and uniqueness theorems on best approximation in such a space were proved in [1] and [2]. In this note we take a stronger version of the notion of strict convexity and characterize such metric spaces. As a result we get the unicity theorem of best approximation 'Every convex proximinal set in a strictly convex metric space is chebyshev' and its converse.

Before proceeding to our main results, we recall few definitions:
Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space and $x, y, z \in X$. We say that the point $z$ is between $x$ and $y$ (writing $x z y$ ) if

$$
d(x, z)+d(z, y)=d(x, y)
$$

For any two points $x, y$ of $X$, the set

$$
\{z \in X: d(x, z)+d(z, y)=d(x, y)\}
$$

i.e. the set of all those points which lie between $x$ and $y$, is called the segment $[x, y]$.

A metric space $(X, d)$ is said to be convex [4] if for every two points $x$ and $y \in X$, there exists $z \in X$ such that $x \neq y \neq z$ and $x z y$ i.e. if for every $x, y$ in $X$ and for every $t, 0 \leqq t \leqq 1$ there exists at least one point $z$ such that

$$
d(x, z)=(1-t) d(x, y) \quad \text { and } \quad d(z, y)=t d(x, y)
$$

The space is said to be strongly convex [4] if such a $z$ exists and is unique for each pair $x$ and $y$ of $X$.

Thus for strongly convex metric spaces each $t, 0 \leqq t \leqq 1$, determines a unique point of the segment $[x, y]$.

A strongly convex metric space $(X, d)$ is said to be strictly convex if for every $x, y$ of $X$ and $r>0$,
$d(x, p) \leqq r, d(y, p) \leqq r$ imply $d(z, p)<r$ unless $x=y$, where $p$ is arbitrary but fixed point of $X$ and $z$ is any point in the open segment $] x, y[$.

Therefore, in a strictly convex metric space if $x$ and $y$ are any two points on the boundary of a sphere then $] x, y[$ lies strictly inside the sphere.

A subset $K$ of a metric space $(X, d)$ is said to be convex [1] if for every $x, y \in K$, any point between $x$ and $y$ is also in $K$ i.e. for each $x, y$ in $K$, the segment $[x, y]$ lies in $K$.

Let $S$ be a subset of a metric space $(X, d)$ and $z$ be a point of $S$. Let

$$
S_{z}=\{x \in X: d(x, z)=d(x, S)\}
$$

i.e. $S_{z}$ is the set of all those points of $X$ having $z$ as a nearest point in $S$.
$S$ is said to be proximinal if for each point $x$ in $X$ there is a point of $S$ nearest to $x$ i.e. for each $x$ in $X$ there exists at least one point $z \in S$ such that $x \in S_{z}$. If there is a unique such point $z$ for each $x$ in $X$ then $S$ is said to be uniquely proximinal or Chebyshev.

In [1] and [2] the conditions under which $S$ is uniquely proximinal have been studied. We have the following unicity theorem of best approximation, the proof of which is contained in Theorem 2 of [1].

Theorem 1. In a strictly convex metric space whenever a convex set is proximinal, it is uniquely proximinal.

In order to show that the converse of the above theorem also holds, we establish a lemma.

Lemma. For any two points $x, y$ in a strongly convex metric space $(X, d)$ the function

$$
\Phi=\Phi_{x, y}:[x, y] \rightarrow[0, d(x, y)] \subseteq R
$$

taking $z \in[x, y]$ to the real number $d(x, z)$ is an isometry.
Proof. We can assume $x \neq y$. Let $z \in[x, y]$ and $z^{\prime} \in[z, y]$. Then

$$
\begin{gathered}
d(x, y)=d(x, z)+d(z, y)= \\
=d(x, z)+d\left(z, z^{\prime}\right)+d\left(z^{\prime}, y\right) \geqq d\left(x, z^{\prime}\right)+d\left(z^{\prime}, y\right) \geqq d(x, y) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
d(x, y)=d\left(x, z^{\prime}\right)+d\left(z^{\prime}, y\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\Phi\left(z^{\prime}\right)=d\left(x, z^{\prime}\right)=d(x, z)+d\left(z, z^{\prime}\right)=\Phi(z)+d\left(z, z^{\prime}\right)
$$

implying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Phi\left(z^{\prime}\right)-\Phi(z)\right|=d\left(z, z^{\prime}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The equality (1) shows that $z^{\prime} \in[x, y]$ and implies that $[x, y]$ is convex, and the equality (2) shows that $\Phi$ is an isometry.

Corollary. For any two points $x, y$ in a strongly convex metric space $(X, d)$ the segment $[x, y]$ is a compact set.

The following theorem shows that the converse of the unicity Theorem (Theorem 1) is also true.

Theorem 2. Let $(X, d)$ be a strongly convex metric space. Then the following statements are equivalent:
(i) $X$ is strictly convex.
(ii) For each convex set $S$ and distinct points $x$ and $y$ of $S, S_{x} \cap S_{y}=\emptyset$.
(iii) Whenever a convex set is proximinal, it is uniquely proximinal.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii).
Let, if possible, $S_{x} \cap S_{y} \neq \emptyset$ and let $z \in S_{x} \cap S_{y}$. This implies

$$
d(z, x)=d(z, y)=d(z, S)
$$

Now $x, y \in X$ and $X$ is a convex space, therefore there exists $q \in X$ such that $x q y$. $q \in[x, y]$ and $S$ is a convex set, therefore $q \in S$.
Strict convexity of the space implies $d(z, q)<d(z, S)$, which is a contradiction. (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii).

Let a convex set $S$ be proximinal. Let $p \in X$. Since $S$ is proximinal, there exists $x \in S$ such that $p \in S_{x}$.

Let if possible, $y \neq x$ be also nearest to $p$, then $p \in S_{y}$. Thus $p \in S_{x} \cap S_{y}, x \neq y$, which is a contradiction.
(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i).

Let $x \neq y, p$ be points of $(X, d)$ with $d(x, p)=d(y, p)=r$ (say). Define

$$
f: I:=[0, d(x, y)] \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}
$$

as

$$
f(t)=d\left(p, \Phi_{x, y}^{-1}(t)\right)
$$

Then $f$ is continuous. Moreover, since $[x, y]$ is a compact, convex subset, the hypothesis (iii) implies that there exists no subinterval $\left[t_{1}, t_{2}\right] \subseteq I, t_{1}<t_{2}$, such that

$$
f\left(t_{1}\right)=f\left(t_{2}\right)=\min \left\{f(t): t_{1} \leqq t \leqq t_{2}\right\} .
$$

We affirm that all interior points $t \in] 0, d(x, y)$ [satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t)<\max f=f(0)=f(d(x, y)) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let, if possible, $f\left(t_{0}\right) \geqq \max f$ for some interior point. Set

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^{\prime} & =\min \left\{f(t): t \leqq t_{0}\right\} \\
m^{\prime \prime} & =\min \left\{f(t): t \geqq t_{0}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose $\boldsymbol{m}^{\prime} \geqq m^{\prime \prime}$. Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t_{0}^{\prime}=\inf \left\{t: t \leqq t_{0}, \min \left\{f\left(t_{1}\right): t \leqq t_{1} \leqq t_{0}\right\} \geqq m^{\prime}\right\} \\
& t_{0}^{\prime \prime}=\sup \left\{t: t \geqq t_{0}, \min \left\{f\left(t_{2}\right): t_{0} \leqq t_{2} \leqq t\right\} \geqq m^{\prime}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\boldsymbol{f}$ is continuous it follows that

$$
f\left(t_{0}^{\prime}\right)=f\left(t_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right)=\min \left\{f(t): t_{0}^{\prime} \leqq t \leqq t_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right\} .
$$

If $t_{0}^{\prime}<t_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ then $\left[t_{0}^{\prime}, t_{0}^{\prime \prime}\right]$ is the subinterval leading to a contradiction, if $t_{0}^{\prime}=t_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ then $I=[0, d(x, y)]$ is the subinterval leading to a contradiction. If $m^{\prime} \leqq m^{\prime \prime}$, a contradiction can be reached in an analogous fashion.

Since $\Phi$ is an isometry, (3) implies $d(z, p)<r$ for any point $z$ in the open segment $] x, y[$. Hence the space is strictly convex.
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