# COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

# V. W. BRYANT The convexity of the subset space of a metric space

*Compositio Mathematica*, tome 22, nº 4 (1970), p. 383-385 <http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM 1970 22 4 383 0>

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1970, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (http: //http://www.compositio.nl/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

# $\mathcal{N}$ umdam

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques http://www.numdam.org/

## THE CONVEXITY OF THE SUBSET SPACE OF A METRIC SPACE

by

### V. W. Bryant

Let (X, d) be a metric space and let  $d^*$  be the Hausdorff metric on the set  $X^*$  consisting of the non-empty closed bounded subsets of X. In this paper we consider what conditions on (X, d) will ensure that  $(X^*, d^*)$  is metrically convex.

DEFINITION. (i) (X, d) is (metrically) convex if for any two distinct points  $x, y \in X$  there exists  $z \in X$ , distinct from them both, with

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

(ii) (X, d) is a (metric) segment space if for any  $x, y \in X$  there exists an isometry  $f: [0, d(x, y)] \to (X, d)$  with f(0) = x and f(d(x, y)) = y.

It is clear that every segment space is convex, and it has been shown that the two concepts coincide in a complete space (see, for example, [1; p. 41]). Now, if  $A \subseteq X$  and  $0 \leq \delta$ , then the set  $A_{\delta}$  is defined by

$$A_{\delta} = \{ x \in X : \exists a \in A \quad \text{with} \quad d(x, a) \leq \delta \}.$$

We note that in any metric space  $\overline{A} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_{1/n}$ , and that in any segment space  $A_{\gamma+\delta} = (A_{\gamma})_{\delta}$  for  $0 \leq \gamma, \delta$ . The Hausdorff metric  $d^*$  is defined on  $X^*$  by

$$d^*(A, B) = \inf\{0 \leq \delta : B \subseteq A_\delta \text{ and } A \subseteq B_\delta\}$$
  $(A, B \in X^*).$ 

It is known that if (X, d) is compact (resp. complete), then  $(X^*, d^*)$  is compact (resp. complete), proofs of these results being found in [3; p. 38] and [2; p. 29 IV].

We are now ready to investigate the convexity of  $(X^*, d^*)$ . Since  $d^*(\{x\}, \{y\}) = d(x, y)$  for  $x, y \in X$ , it is clear that the convexity of  $(X^*, d^*)$  implies the convexity of (X, d). The theorem below shows when the converse implication holds.

THEOREM. If (X, d) is a compact convex metric space, then so too is  $(X^*, d^*)$ .

V. W. Bryant

**PROOF.** In view of the above remarks we need only show that  $(X^*, d^*)$  is convex. Let  $A, B \in X^*$  with  $d^*(A, B) = \delta > 0$ . Then by the compactness of (X, d) (and hence of A, B)  $\overline{A_{\delta}} = A_{\delta}$  and  $\overline{B_{\delta}} = B_{\delta}$ . Since (X, d) is a segment space it follows that

$$A \subseteq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_{\delta+1/n} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (B_{\delta})_{1/n} = \overline{B_{\delta}} = B_{\delta}$$

and similarly  $B \subseteq A_{\delta}$ . Let  $C = A_{\delta/2} \cap B_{\delta/2}$ . Then we show that  $C \neq \phi$ (whence  $C \in X^*$ ) and that  $d^*(A, C) = d^*(C, B) = \frac{1}{2}d^*(A, B)$ . If  $a \in A \subseteq B_{\delta}$ , then  $d(a, b) \leq \delta$  for some  $b \in B$  and there exists  $c \in C$ with  $d(a, c) = d(c, b) = \frac{1}{2}d(a, b) \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta$ . Thus  $c \in A_{\delta/2} \cap B_{\delta/2} = C$  and  $a \in C_{\delta/2}$ . This shows that  $C \neq \phi$  and  $A \subseteq C_{\delta/2}$ , and similarly  $B \subseteq C_{\delta/2}$ . Thus  $C \in X^*$ ,  $d^*(A, C) \leq \delta/2$  and  $d^*(C, B) \leq \delta/2$ . But

$$\delta = d^*(A, B) \leq d^*(A, C) + d^*(C, B) \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta + \frac{1}{2}\delta = \delta$$

and so  $d^*(A, C) = d^*(C, B) = \frac{1}{2}d^*(A, B)$  as required. Hence  $(X^*, d^*)$  is a convex space and the theorem is proved.

We now give examples to show that neither the total-boundedness nor the completeness of a convex space (X, d) necessarily implies the convexity of  $(X^*, d^*)$ .

1. Let X be the subspace of 3-dimensional Euclidean Space given by

$$X = \{(x, y, z) : x^2 + y^2 < 1, |z| \le 1\} \cup \{(x, y, z) : x^2 + y^2 = 1, x \text{ rational}, z = -1\} \cup \{(x, y, z) : x^2 + y^2 = 1, x \text{ irrat}, z = 1\}.$$

Then (X, d) is a totally bounded segment space. However, by considering

$$A = \{(x, y, z) \in X : x^2 + y^2 = 1, z = -1\} \in X^*$$
$$B = \{(x, y, z) \in X : x^2 + y^2 = 1, z = -1\} \in X^*$$

we see that  $(X^*, d^*)$  is not convex.

2. Let X be the normed vector space of all real null sequences with metric d induced by the usual norm. Then (X, d) is a complete segment space and we show that  $(X^*, d^*)$  is not convex. For if

 $A = \{\{x_n\} \in X : x_n \neq 0 \text{ for an odd no. of } n, \text{ and } x_n = 1 + 1/n \text{ whenever } x_n \neq 0\} \in X^*$ 

 $B = \{\{x_n\} \in X : x_n \neq 0 \text{ for an even no. of } n, \text{ and } x_n = 1 + 1/n \text{ whenever } x_n \neq 0\} \in X^*,$ 

then  $d^*(A, B) = 1$  and  $\overline{A_{\frac{1}{2}}} \cap \overline{B_{\frac{1}{2}}} = A_{\frac{1}{2}} \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}} = \phi$ . Thus there exists no  $C \in X^*$  with  $d^*(A, C) = d^*(C, B) = \frac{1}{2}d^*(A, B)$ . It follows that  $(X^*, d^*)$  is neither a segment space nor a convex space.

384

Finally we give an example to show that the existence of a segment from  $\{x\}$  to  $\{y\}$  in  $(X^*, d^*)$  does not imply the existence of a segment from x to y in (X, d).

3. Let X be the subset of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  given by  $X = \{(x, y) : |x| < 1, 0 \le y \le 1$ and (x is rational if and only if y is) $\} \cup \{(-1, 0), (1, 0)\}$ , and define a metric d on X by

$$d((x, y), (x', y')) = |y - y'| \cdot (1 - \max(|x|, |x'|)) + |x - x'|, ((x, y), (x', y') \in X).$$

Then  $d^*(\{(-1, 0)\}, \{(1, 0)\}) = 2$  and the mapping  $f : [0, 2] \rightarrow (X^*, d^*)$ given by  $f(\lambda) = \{(x, y) \in X : x = \lambda - 1\}$  for  $\lambda \in [0, 2]$  is an isometry with  $f(0) = \{(-1, 0)\}$  and  $f(2) = \{(1, 0)\}$ . This is therefore a segment between  $\{(-1, 0)\}$  and  $\{(1, 0)\}$  in  $(X^*, d^*)$ . However, there exists no segment between (-1, 0) and (1, 0) in (X, d).

#### REFERENCES

L. M. BLUMENTHAL
[1] Distance Geometry, Oxford, 1953.
C. KURATOWSKI
[2] Topologie I (2nd edition), Warsaw, 1948.
C. KURATOWSKI

[3] Topologie II, Warsaw, 1950.

(Oblatum 16-III-1970)

Dr. V. W. Bryant, Department of Pure Mathematics, The University of Sheffield, England.