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## Numdam

# 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 $f:[0, d(x, y)] \rightarrow(X, d)$ 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 $0 \leqq \delta$, then the set $A_{\delta}$ is defined by

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

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

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

It is known that if $(X, d)$ is compact (resp. complete), then $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ 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 $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$. Since $d^{*}(\{x\},\{y\})=d(x, y)$ for $x, y \in X$, it is clear that the convexity of $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ 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 $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$.

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

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

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 $d(a, b) \leqq \delta$ for some $b \in B$ and there exists $c \in C$ with $d(a, c)=d(c, b)=\frac{1}{2} d(a, b) \leqq \frac{1}{2} \delta$. 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 $C \in X^{*}, d^{*}(A, C) \leqq \delta / 2$ and $d^{*}(C, B) \leqq \delta / 2$. But

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

and so $d^{*}(A, C)=d^{*}(C, B)=\frac{1}{2} d^{*}(A, B)$ as required. Hence $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ 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

$$
\begin{aligned}
& X=\left\{(x, y, z): x^{2}+y^{2}<1,|z| \leqq 1\right\} \cup\left\{(x, y, z): x^{2}+y^{2}=1\right. \\
&x \text { rational, } z=-1\} \cup\left\{(x, y, z): x^{2}+y^{2}=1, x \text { irrat }, z=1\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

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

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=\left\{(x, y, z) \in X: x^{2}+y^{2}=1, z=-1\right\} \in X^{*} \\
& B=\left\{(x, y, z) \in X: x^{2}+y^{2}=1, z=1\right\} \in X^{*}
\end{aligned}
$$

we see that $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ 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 $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ is not convex. For if

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

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

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 $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ is neither a segment space nor a convex space.

Finally we give an example to show that the existence of a segment from $\{x\}$ to $\{y\}$ in $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ does not imply the existence of a segment from $x$ to $y$ in $(X, d)$.
3. Let $X$ be the subset of $R^{2}$ given by $X=\{(x, y):|x|<1,0 \leqq y \leqq 1$ and $(x$ is rational if and only if $y$ is $)\} \cup\{(-1,0),(1,0)\}$, and define a metric $d$ on $X$ by
$d\left((x, y),\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)\right)=\left|y-y^{\prime}\right| \cdot\left(1-\max \left(|x|,\left|x^{\prime}\right|\right)\right)+\left|x-x^{\prime}\right|$,
$\left((x, y),\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \in X\right)$.
Then $d^{*}(\{(-1,0)\},\{(1,0)\})=2$ and the mapping $f:[0,2] \rightarrow\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$ 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 $\left(X^{*}, d^{*}\right)$. However, there exists no segment between $(-1,0)$ and $(1,0)$ in $(X, d)$.
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