

Denka Kutzarova

A nearly uniformly convex space which is not a (β) -space

Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Mathematica et Physica, Vol. 30 (1989), No. 2, 95--98

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/701800>

Terms of use:

© Univerzita Karlova v Praze, 1989

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

A Nearly Uniformly Convex Space which is not a (β) -Space

DENKA KUTZAROVA

Sofia*)

Received 15 March 1989

An example is given of a nearly uniformly convex Banach space which is not a (β) -space. This answers a question of Rolewicz.

The Kuratowski measure of noncompactness of a set A in a Banach space X is the infimum $\alpha(A)$ of those $\varepsilon > 0$ for which there is a covering of A by a finite number of sets A_i with $\text{diam}(A_i) < \varepsilon$.

A norm $\|\cdot\|$ in a Banach space X is said to be Δ -uniformly convex (see [3] and [8]) if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for each convex set E contained in the closed unit ball with $\alpha(E) > \varepsilon$, we have $\inf\{\|x\|: x \in E\} < 1 - \delta$. This is equivalent to the notion of nearly uniform convexity of the norm (NUC), introduced by Huff [4].

Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space with closed unit ball B . By the drop $D(x, B)$ defined by an element $x \in X$, $x \notin B$, we mean the convex hull of the set $\{x\} \cup B$. Denote $R(x, B) = D(x, B) \setminus B$. The norm is called to satisfy condition (β) (cf. [8]) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $1 < \|x\| < 1 + \delta$ implies $\alpha(R(x, B)) < \varepsilon$. The space X is a (β) -space if it admits an equivalent norm which satisfies the condition (β) .

Rolewicz [8] has proved that uniform convexity \Rightarrow condition $(\beta) \Rightarrow$ (NUC) and he has posed the question about the converse implications up to renorming. In [6] we have proved that the class of (β) -spaces does not coincide with that of super-reflexive spaces (independently shown by Montesinos and Torregrosa [7]). In this paper we shall show that it does not coincide with the class of nearly uniformly convexifiable spaces, either.

Consider the example from [5] of a reflexive Banach space which does not admit an equivalent norm, uniformly differentiable in every direction. Let $\Gamma = \prod_{i=2}^{\infty} \{1, 2, \dots, i\}$. That is, Γ is the family of all sequences $\gamma = \{\gamma^i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of positive integers such that $1 \leq \gamma^i \leq i + 1$. Denote by Φ_{Γ} the family of all finite subsets of Γ which have the

*) Institute of Mathematics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1090 Sofia, Bulgaria

property that, if $A \in \Phi_\Gamma$, then there is a positive integer m such that, if $\gamma_k = \{\gamma_k^i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ and $\gamma_j = \{\gamma_j^i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ are different members of A , then $\gamma_k^m \neq \gamma_j^m$ and $\gamma_k^i = \gamma_j^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$. We denote by X the space of all real - valued functions x on Γ such that

$$\|x\| = \sup \left\{ \left[\sum_{n \in N} \left(\sum_{\gamma \in A_n} |x(\gamma)| \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \right\} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite systems $\{A_n\}_{n \in N}$ with each $A_n \in \Phi_\Gamma$ and $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$.

It is shown in [6] that the space X is Δ -uniformly convex. The proof of the following statement is inspired by ideas of Day [2].

Theorem. The space X is not a (β) - space.

Proof. Suppose the contrary, i.e. there exists an equivalent norm $|\cdot|$ in X which satisfies the condition (β) . We may assume without loss of generality that

$$(1) \quad \|x\| \leq |x| \leq M\|x\| \quad \text{for every } x \in X,$$

where $1 \leq M < \infty$.

Put $\varepsilon = 1/M$.

Denote by B_1 the closed unit ball with respect to the norm $|\cdot|$. By the assumption, $|\cdot|$ satisfies (β) , thus we may choose and fix a $\delta > 0$ so that

$$(2) \quad x \in X, \quad 1 < |x| < 1 + 2\delta \quad \text{imply} \quad \alpha(R(x, B_1)) < \varepsilon/2.$$

Fix n large enough so that

$$(3) \quad \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)^n > 1.$$

For $\gamma = \{\gamma^i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \Gamma$ let $\pi_j(\gamma) = \gamma^j, j = 1, 2, \dots$

First step. Define the following sets in X

$T_i^{(0)} = \{\varepsilon\chi_{\{\gamma\}} : \gamma \in \Gamma, \pi_j(\gamma) = 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq j < 2^n - 1 \text{ and } \pi_j(\gamma) = i, \text{ for } j = 2^n - 1\}$, where $1 \leq i \leq 2^n$.

Consider a couple $(T_{2k-1}^{(0)}, T_{2k}^{(0)})$, $1 \leq k \leq 2^{n-1}$. Choose and fix an arbitrary $t' \in T_{2k-1}^{(0)}$. Put $x = (1 + \delta)t'$. We have that $\|x\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta)$, whence $|x| \leq 1 + \delta$.

First case. $|x| > 1$.

Let $y \in T_{2k}^{(0)}$ be arbitrary. Obviously, $\|y\| = \varepsilon$ and thus $|y| \leq 1$. Then, $(x + y)/2 \in D(x, B_1)$. For different elements we have

$$|(x + y_1)/2 - (x + y_2)/2| = |y_1 - y_2|/2 \geq \|y_1 - y_2\|/2 > \varepsilon/2.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (2) that $\alpha(x, B_1) < \varepsilon/2$. Therefore, the relation $(x + y)/2 \in R(x, B_1)$ is fulfilled for at most finite subset of $T_{2k}^{(0)}$. Since the set $T_{2k}^{(0)}$ is infinite, we obtain that for infinitely many $y \in T_{2k}^{(0)}$ the following holds

$$|(x + y)/2| \leq 1.$$

Moreover, $\|(x + y)/2\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)$.

Second case. $|x| \leq 1$. Then the element x itself will do but for the sake of uniformity we shall consider again $(x + y)/2$ for arbitrary $y \in T_{2k}^{(0)}$. Clearly, $|(x + y)/2| \leq 1$ and

$$\|(x + y)/2\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2).$$

Now in both cases, let us vary the element $t' \in T_{2k-1}^{(0)}$. It is easy to observe that we may find an infinite set $T_k^{(1)}$ of elements $t = (x + y)/2$ of the form above with $|t| \leq 1$ so that the conditions $t_1, t_2 \in T_k^{(1)}$, $t_1 \neq t_2$ imply $\text{supp } t_1 \cap \text{supp } t_2 = \emptyset$ and hence $\|t_1 - t_2\| > \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2) > \varepsilon$.

Second step. Similarly, consider $(T_{2k-1}^{(1)}, T_{2k}^{(1)})$, $1 \leq k \leq 2^{n-2}$. Fix an arbitrary $t' \in T_{2k-1}^{(1)}$ and put $x = (1 + \delta)t'$. We have that

$$\|x\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)(1 + \delta) \quad \text{and} \quad |x| \leq 1 + \delta.$$

Consider the case $|x| > 1$. Let $y \in T_{2k}^{(1)}$ be arbitrary. We have $\|y\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)$ and $|y| \leq 1$. Since $\text{supp } x \cup \text{supp } y \in \Phi_r$, then $\|x + y\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)(2 + \delta)$, i.e.

$$\|(x + y)/2\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)^2.$$

According to the choice of $T_i^{(1)}$, $1 \leq i \leq 2^{n-1}$, we have that for different elements $y_1, y_2 \in T_{2k}^{(1)}$ the inequality $\|y_1 - y_2\| > \varepsilon$ holds, which gives

$$|(x + y_1)/2 - (x + y_2)/2| > \varepsilon/2.$$

As in the first step, it follows from (2) that for infinitely many $y \in T_{2k}^{(1)}$ it is true that

$$|(x + y)/2| \leq 1.$$

If $|x| \leq 1$, we have again for each $y \in T_{2k}^{(1)}$,

$$|(x + y)/2| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|(x + y)/2\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)^2.$$

Then, we vary $t' \in T_{2k-1}^{(1)}$. Find an infinite set $T_k^{(2)}$ of elements $t = (x + y)/2$ with $|t| \leq 1$ so that different members $t_1, t_2 \in T_k^{(2)}$ have disjoint supports and hence $\|t_1 - t_2\| > \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)^2 > \varepsilon$.

We can repeat $n - 2$ more times and thus we shall obtain a non-void set $T_1^{(n)}$ such that for $t \in T_1^{(n)}$,

$$|t| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|t\| = \varepsilon(1 + \delta/2)^n.$$

By (1) and (3), this is a contradiction, which completes the proof.

Remark. We may also give a separable example of a (NUC)-space which is not a (β) -space. Consider the example of A. Baernstein [1] of a reflexive Banach space which does not possess the Banach-Saks property. In order to show that it is not a (β) -space, we can use the same argument. More precisely, represent the set of all integers, greater than 2^n , as a union of 2^n disjoint infinite subsets and procede as above. In [6] we have proved that this space is (NUC).

References

- [1] BAERNSTEIN II A., On reflexivity and summability, *Studia Math.* 42 (1972), 91—94.
- [2] DAY M. M., Reflexive Banach spaces not isomorphic to uniformly convex spaces, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 47 (1941), 313—317.
- [3] GOEBEL K. and SĘKOWSKI T., The modulus of noncompact convexity, *Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, Sect. A*, 38 (1984), 41—88.
- [4] HUFF R., Banach spaces which are nearly uniformly convex, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* 10 (1980), 743—749.
- [5] KUTZAROVA D. N. and TROYANSKI S. L., Reflexive Banach spaces without equivalent norms which are uniformly convex or uniformly differentiable in every direction, *Studia Math.* 72 (1982), 91—95.
- [6] KUTZAROVA D. N., On condition (β) and \mathcal{A} -uniform convexity, *Compt. rend. Acad. bulg. Sci.*, to appear.
- [7] MONTESINOS V. and TORREGROSA J. R., A uniform geometric property of Banach spaces, to appear.
- [8] ROLEWICZ S., On \mathcal{A} -uniform convexity and drop property, *Studia Math.* 87 (1987), 181—191.