Minoru Matsuda

A remark on localized weak precompactness in Banach spaces

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 40 (1999), No. 2, 271--276

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/119082

Comment.Math.Univ.Carolin. 40,2 (1999)271–276 

# A remark on localized weak precompactness in Banach spaces

Minoru Matsuda

*Abstract.* We give a characterization of $K$-weakly precompact sets in terms of uniform Gateaux differentiability of certain continuous convex functions.

*Keywords:* $K$-weakly precompact set, uniform Gateaux differentiability

*Classification:* 46B07, 46B22, 49J50

We begin with the requisite definition. Throughout this paper $X$ denotes a real Banach space with topological dual $X^*$. If $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous convex function, for $x, y \in X$, we define $Dg(x, y)$ by

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\{g(x + ty) - g(x)\}/t$$

provided that this limit exists, and we also define the subdifferential of $g$ at $x$ ($\in X$) to be the set $\partial g(x)$ of all elements $x^*$ of $X^*$ satisfying that $(u, x^*) \leq g(x+u)-g(x)$ for any $u \in X$. Then $\partial g(x)$ is a non-empty weak*-compact convex subset of $X^*$ for every $x \in X$. The triple $(I, \Lambda, \lambda)$ refers to the Lebesgue measure space on $I$ ($= [0, 1]$), $\Lambda^+$ to the sets in $\Lambda$ with positive $\lambda$-measure. We always understand that $I$ is endowed with $\Lambda$ and $\lambda$. We denote the set $\{\chi_E/\lambda(E) : E \in \Lambda^+\}$ by $\Delta(I)$. A function $f : I \to X^*$ is said to be weak*-measurable if $(x, f(t))$ is $\lambda$-measurable for each $x \in X$. If $f : I \to X^*$ is a bounded weak*-measurable function, we obtain a bounded linear operator $T_f : X \to L_1(I, \Lambda, \lambda)$ given by $T_f(x) = x \circ f$ for every $x \in X$, where $(x \circ f)(t) = (x, f(t))$ for every $t \in I$, and the dual operator of $T_f$ is denoted by $T_f^*$ ($: L_\infty(I, \Lambda, \lambda) \to X^*$).

According to Bator and Lewis [1], let us define the notion of localized weak precompactness in Banach spaces as follows.

**Definition 1.** *Let $A$ be a bounded subset of $X$ and $K$ a weak*-compact subset of $X$. Then we say that $A$ is $K$-weakly precompact if every sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $A$ has a pointwise convergent subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ on $K$.*

Then, in [1], they have made a systematic study of $K$-weakly precompact sets $A$ in Banach spaces and obtained various characterizations of such sets.

Succeedingly, in our paper [4], we also have obtained measure theoretic characterizations of $K$-weakly precompact sets $A$ by the effective use of a $K$-valued weak*-measurable function constructed in the case where $A$ is non-$K$-weakly precompact. In this paper we wish to add a characterization of $K$-weakly precompact sets in terms of uniform Gateaux differentiability of certain continuous convex functions, which is our aim. This can be regarded as a slight generalization and refinement of Corollary 10 in [1]. And it should be noted that even here this $K$-valued function also becomes an effective means to an end. Before giving our characterization theorem, let us define some special continuous convex functions on $X$ as follows.

**Definition 2.** *Let $H$ be a non-empty bounded subset of $X^*$. Then the continuous convex function associated with $H$, which is denoted by $g_H$, is defined by $g_H(x) = \sup\{(x, x^*) : x^* \in H\}$ for every $x \in X$.*

In what follows, all notations and terminology used and not defined are as in [1].

Let $A$ be a bounded subset of $X$, $K$ a weak*-compact subset of $X^*$, $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ a sequence in $A$ and $Y$ the closed linear span of $\{x_n : n \geq 1\}$ in $X$. In the following, we always understand that $Y$ is a such space. Let $j : Y \to X$ be the inclusion mapping and $j^*$ its dual mapping. For any non-empty subset $H$ of $K$, the continuous convex function $g_H : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies that $\partial g_H(y) \subset \overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$ for each $y \in Y$. Further let us note two preliminary facts for the proof of Theorem. One concerns separably related sets in the case where $A$ is $K$-weakly precompact. Let $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence in $A$ and suppose that there exists a subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty}(x_{n(k)}, x^*)$ exists for every $x^* \in K$. Then this implies that $\lim_{k\to\infty}(x_{n(k)}, y^*)$ exists for every $y^* \in \overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$. Hence, by considering the mapping $L : \overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K)) \to c$ (the Banach space of all convergent sequences of real numbers equipped with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$) defined by $L(y^*) = \{(x_{n(k)}, y^*)\}_{k\geq 1}$, we easily know that $\overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$ is separably related to $\{x_{n(k)} : k \geq 1\}$, since $c$ is separable. The other concerns the construction of a $K$-valued weak*-measurable function $h$ and a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $A$ in the case where $A$ is non-$K$-weakly precompact. Then, although the construction of this function $h$ and the sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $A$ is exactly the same as in § 3 of [4], for the sake of completeness, we state its outline briefly in the following. Since $A$ is not $K$-weakly precompact, by the celebrated argument of Rosenthal [5], we have a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $A$ and real numbers $r$ and $\delta$ with $\delta > 0$ such that putting $A_n = \{x^* \in K : (x_n, x^*) \leq r\}$ and $B_n = \{x^* \in K : (x_n, x^*) \geq r+\delta\}$, $(A_n, B_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is an independent sequence of pairs of weak*-closed subsets of $K$ (that is, for every $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{1\leq j\leq k}$ with $\varepsilon_j = 1$ or $-1$, $\bigcap\{\varepsilon_j A_j : 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ is a non-empty set, where $\varepsilon_j A_j = A_j$ if $\varepsilon_j = 1$ and $\varepsilon_j A_j = B_j$ if $\varepsilon_j = -1$). Putting $\Gamma = \bigcap_{n\geq 1}(A_n \cup B_n)$, $\Gamma$ is a non-empty weak*-compact subset of $K$, since $(A_n, B_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is independent. Define $\varphi : \Gamma \to \mathcal{P}(N)$ (Cantor space, with its usual compact metric topology) by $\varphi(x^*) = \{p : (x_p, x^*) \leq r\}$ $(= \{p : A_p \ni x^*\}) \in \mathcal{P}(N)$. Then $\varphi$ is a continuous surjection from $\Gamma$ to $\mathcal{P}(N)$ (here, $\Gamma$ is endowed with the weak*-topology $\sigma(X^*, X)$) and so we have a Radon probability measure $\gamma$ on $\Gamma$ such that $\varphi(\gamma) = \nu$ (the normalized Haar measure if we identify $\mathcal{P}(N)$ with $\{0,1\}^N$)

and $\{f \circ \varphi : f \in L_1(\mathcal{P}(N), \Sigma_\nu, \nu)\} = L_1(\Gamma, \Sigma_\gamma, \gamma)$ where $\Sigma_\nu$ (resp. $\Sigma_\gamma$) is the family of all $\nu$ (resp. $\gamma$)-measurable subsets of $\mathcal{P}(N)$ (resp. $\Gamma$). Further, consider a function $\tau : \mathcal{P}(N) \to I$ defined by $\tau(D) = \Sigma\{1/2^m : m \in D\}$ for every $D \in \mathcal{P}(N)$. Then $\tau$ is a continuous surjection such that $\tau(\nu) = \lambda$ and $\{u \circ \tau : u \in L_1(I, \Lambda, \lambda)\} = L_1(\mathcal{P}(N), \Sigma_\nu, \nu)$. Then, making use of the lifting theory, we have a weak*-measurable function $h : I \to \Gamma$ $(\subset K)$ such that

$$(\alpha) \qquad \rho(x \circ h)(t) = (x, h(t)) \quad \text{for every } \ x \in X \ \text{ and every } \ t \in I,$$

$$(\beta) \qquad \int_E (x, h(t))\, d\lambda(t) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(E))} (x, x^*)\, d\gamma(x^*)$$

for every $E \in \Lambda$ and every $x \in X$. Here $\rho$ denotes a lifting on $L_\infty(I, \Lambda, \lambda)$.

Now we are ready to state our characterization theorem (a localized version of Theorem 8 in [1]). Its main part is that (3) implies (1), whose proof is significant in the point that the characters of the $K$-valued function $h$ and the sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $A$ obtained above are used concretely and effectively. And there, we can get a result that for every $y \in Y$ and every subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$, $Dg_H(y, x_{n(k)})$ does not exist uniformly in $k$, where $H = h(I)$ $(\subset K)$.

**Theorem.** *Let $A$ be a bounded subset of $X$ and $K$ a weak*-compact (not necessarily convex) subset of $X^*$. Then the following statements about $A$ and $K$ are equivalent.*

(1) *The set $A$ is $K$-weakly precompact.*

(2) *If $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ is a sequence in $A$ and $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous convex function such that $\partial g(y) \subset \overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$ for every $y \in Y$, then there exists a dense $G_\delta$-subset $G$ of $Y$ and a subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $Dg(y, x_{n(k)})$ exists uniformly in $k$ for each $y \in G$.*

(3) *If $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ is a sequence in $A$ and $H$ is a non-empty subset of $K$, then there exists an element $y$ of $Y$ and a subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $Dg_H(y, x_{n(k)})$ exists uniformly in $k$.*

Proof: (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). The proof is analogous to that of the corresponding part of Theorem 8 in [1]. Suppose that (1) holds. Take any sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $A$ and any continuous convex function $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\partial g(y) \subset \overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$ for every $y \in Y$. As $A$ is $K$-weakly precompact, we have a subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty}(x_{n(k)}, x^*)$ exists for every $x^* \in K$. Therefore, by the first preliminary fact preceding Theorem, $\overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$ is separably related to $B$ $(= \{x_{n(k)} : k \geq 1\})$. So it is separably related to $\text{aco}(B)$ (: the absolutely convex hull of $B$). Since $\partial g(y) \subset \overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$ for every $y \in Y$, by the same argument as in Theorem 3.14 and Proposition 3.15 of [2], we have a dense $G_\delta$-subset $G$ of $Y$ such that $g$ is $\text{aco}(B)$-differentiable (cf. [2]) at every $y \in G$, whence (2) holds.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). This follows immediately from the fact that $\partial g_H(y) \subset \overline{\text{co}}^*(j^*(K))$ for every non-empty subset $H$ of $K$ and every $y \in Y$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). The proof of this part is crucial. Suppose that (1) fails. By the second preliminary fact preceding Theorem, we have a function $h : I \to K$ and a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $A$ as stated above. Take $H = h(I)$, and let $\{U(n,k) : n = 0,1,\ldots; k = 0,\ldots,2^n - 1\}$ be a system of open intervals in $I$ given by $U(n,k) = (k/2^n, (k+1)/2^n)$ if $n \geq 0$, $0 \leq k \leq 2^n - 1$. Then we get that $\varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(U(n,2k))) \subset B_n$ and $\varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(U(n,2k+1))) \subset A_n$ for $n = 1,2,\ldots$ and $k = 0,\ldots,2^{n-1}-1$. Further we note a following elementary fact: Let $E \in \Lambda^+$ and $\{n(i)\}_{i\geq 1}$ be a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers. Then there exists a natural number $i$ and a non-negative number $q$ with $0 \leq 2q < 2^{n(i)} - 1$ such that both $E \cap U(n(i),2q)$ and $E \cap U(n(i),2q+1)$ are in $\Lambda^+$, which can be easily shown by an argument used in Lemma 2 of [3].

Now, let us show that for every subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ and every $y \in Y$, $Dg_H(y, x_{n(k)})$ does not exist uniformly in $k$. To this end, take any point $y$ in $Y$ and any subsequence $\{x_{n(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of $\{x_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ , and set $y_k = x_{n(k)}$ for every $k$. Consider a family of weak*-open slices of $\overline{\mathrm{co}}^*(j^*(T_h^*(\Delta(I))))$ $(= M)$ : $\{S(y,\delta/3i,M) : i \geq 1\}$. Then we have that for every $i$

$$\begin{aligned} S(y,\delta/3i,M) &= \Big\{y^* \in M : (y,y^*) > \sup_{z^*\in M}(y,z^*) - \delta/3i\Big\} \\ &= \Big\{y^* \in M : (y,y^*) > \operatorname*{ess\text{-}sup}_{t\in I}(j(y),h(t)) - \delta/3i\Big\} \\ &= \Big\{y^* \in M : (y,y^*) > g_H(y) - \delta/3i\Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

since $g_H(y) = \sup_{t\in I}(j(y),h(t)) = \text{ess-sup}_{t\in I}(j(y),h(t))$ by virtue of $(\alpha)$ above. So, letting $E_i = \{t \in I : (j(y),h(t)) > g_H(y) - \delta/3i\}$, we easily get that $E_i \in \Lambda^+$ and $j^*(h(E_i)) \subset S(y,\delta/3i,M)$ for every $i$. Hence, by the elementary fact stated above, there exists a natural number $k(i)$ and a non-negative number $q(i)$ with $0 \leq 2q(i) < 2^{n(k(i))} - 1$ such that both $E_i \cap U(n(k(i)),2q(i))$ and $E_i \cap U(n(k(i)),2q(i)+1)$ are in $\Lambda^+$. For every $i$, let $F_i = E_i \cap U(n(k(i)),2q(i))$ and $G_i = E_i \cap U(n(k(i)),2q(i)+1)$, and let $u_i^* = j^*(T_h^*(\chi_{F_i}/\lambda(F_i)))$ and $v_i^* = j^*(T_h^*(\chi_{G_i}/\lambda(G_i)))$. Then we have that for every $i$

(a) $(y,u_i^*) > g_H(y) - \delta/3i$ and $(y,v_i^*) > g_H(y) - \delta/3i$,

(b) $(y_{k(i)}, u_i^* - v_i^*) \geq \delta$,

(c) $g_H(y + y_{k(i)}/i) \geq (y + y_{k(i)}/i, u_i^*)$ and $g_H(y - y_{k(i)}/i) \geq (y - y_{k(i)}/i, v_i^*)$.

Indeed, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (y,u_i^*) &= (j(y), T_h^*(\chi_{F_i}/\lambda(F_i))) \\ &= \Big\{\int_{F_i}(j(y),h(t))\,d\lambda(t)\Big\}/\lambda(F_i) > g_H(y) - \delta/3i, \end{aligned}$$

since $j^*(h(F_i)) \subset S(y,\delta/3i,M)$. Similarly, $(y,v_i^*) > g_H(y) - \delta/3i$. Thus we have (a). And we can prove (b) as follows. In virtue of $(\beta)$, we have that for every $i$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(y_{k(i)}, u_i^* - v_i^*) \\
&= (j(y_{k(i)}), T_h^*(\chi_{F_i}/\lambda(F_i))) - (j(y_{k(i)}), T_h^*(\chi_{G_i}/\lambda(G_i))) \\
&= (j(x_{n(k(i))}), T_h^*(\chi_{F_i}/\lambda(F_i))) - (j(x_{n(k(i))}), T_h^*(\chi_{G_i}/\lambda(G_i))) \\
&= \Big\{ \int_{F_i} (j(x_{n(k(i))}), h(t))\, d\lambda(t) \Big\} / \lambda(F_i) \\
&\qquad - \Big\{ \int_{G_i} (j(x_{n(k(i))}), h(t))\, d\lambda(t) \Big\} / \lambda(G_i) \\
&= \Big\{ \int_{\varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(F_i))} (j(x_{n(k(i))}), x^*)\, d\gamma(x^*) \Big\} / \lambda(F_i) \\
&\qquad - \Big\{ \int_{\varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(G_i))} (j(x_{n(k(i))}), x^*)\, d\gamma(x^*) \Big\} / \lambda(G_i) \\
&\geq (r+\delta) - r = \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

since $\varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(F_i))$ $(\subset \varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(U(n(k(i)), 2q(i))))) \subset B_{n(k(i))}$, $\varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(G_i))$ $(\subset \varphi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(U(n(k(i)), 2q(i)+1)))) \subset A_{n(k(i))}$ and $\tau(\varphi(\gamma)) = \lambda$. As to (c), we have that for every $i$

$$\begin{aligned}
g_H(y + y_{k(i)}/i) &= \sup_{t \in I} (j(y + y_{k(i)}/i), h(t)) \\
&\geq \Big\{ \int_{F_i} (j(y + y_{k(i)}/i), h(t))\, d\lambda(t) \Big\} / \lambda(F_i) = (y + y_{k(i)}/i, u_i^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $g_H(y - y_{k(i)}/i) \geq (y - y_{k(i)}/i, v_i^*)$. Then, making use of (a), (b) and (c), we have that for every $i$

$$\begin{aligned}
&g_H(y + y_{k(i)}/i) + g_H(y - y_{k(i)}/i) - 2 \cdot g_H(y) \\
&> (y + y_{k(i)}/i, u_i^*) + (y - y_{k(i)}/i, v_i^*) - \{(y, u_i^* + v_i^*) + 2\delta/3i\} \\
&= (y_{k(i)}, u_i^* - v_i^*)/i - 2\delta/3i \geq \delta/3i.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have that for every $i$

$$\{g_H(y + y_{k(i)}/i) + g_H(y - y_{k(i)}/i) - 2 \cdot g_H(y)\}/(1/i) > \delta/3,$$

which implies that $Dg_H(y, x_{n(k)})$ does not exist uniformly in $k$. Thus the proof is complete. $\square$

**Acknowledgment.** The author is grateful to the referee for suggestions in revising the paper.

## References

[1] Bator E.M., Lewis P.W., *Weak precompactness and the weak RNP*, Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. **37** (1989), 443–452.

[2] Fitzpatrick S.P., *Separably related sets and the Radon-Nikodym property*, Illinois J. Math. **29** (1985), 229–247.

[3] Matsuda M., *A characterization of Pettis sets in terms of the Bourgain property*, Math. Japon. **41** (1995), 433–439.

[4] Matsuda M., *On localized weak precompactness in Banach spaces*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **32** (1996), 473–491.

[5] Rosenthal H., *A characterization of Banach spaces containing $l_1$*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **71** (1974), 2411–2413.

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Shizuoka University, Ohya, Shizuoka 422–8529, Japan

*E-mail*: smmmatu@ipcs.shizuoka.ac.jp

(*Received* January 21, 1998, *revised* May 19, 1998)