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#### Abstract

Reflexive spaces are characterized with the help of metric projections which possess a continuity property similar to $n$-lower semi-continuity and admit continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selections. An example showing that almost lower semicontinuity of a metric projection is not sufficient for the existence of a continuous selection is constructed. © 1989 Academic Press, Inc.


## 1 Introduction

Let $(X, \tau)$ be a topological space, and $(Y, d)$ a metric space. A mapping $F: X \rightarrow 2^{Y}$ which associates with every $x \in X$ a non-empty subset $F(x)$ of $Y$ is said to be lower semi-continuous (l.s.c.) (respectively, upper semi-continuous (u.s.c.)) if, for each open set $\mathscr{U}$ in $Y$, the set $\{x \in X: F(x) \cap \mathscr{U} \neq \varnothing\}$ (respectively, the set $\{x \in X: F(x) \subset \mathscr{U}\}$ ) is open in $X$. A mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a selection for $F$ if, for each $x \in X, f(x) \in F(x)$.

One of the most celebrated results on the existence of continuous selections is the following theorem of Michael [11]: If $X$ is a paracompact (e.g., metric) space and $F: X \rightarrow 2^{Y}$ is l.s.c. and has closed convex images, then $F$ admits a continuous selection. The key step in the proof of this theorem is the construction of continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selections. For an arbitrary non-empty set $A \subseteq Y$ and $\varepsilon>0$, let $B_{\varepsilon}(A)$ denote the union of open balls with radii equal to $\varepsilon$ and centers running over $A$. A mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is called an $\varepsilon$-approximate selection for $F: X \rightarrow 2^{Y}$ if for each $x$ in $X f(x) \in$ $B_{\varepsilon}(F(x))$.

In [7] Deutsch and Kenderov introduced two continuity properties for multivalued mappings and identified topologically those mappings which admit continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selections.

Definition (Deutsch and Kenderov). A multivalued mapping $F$ : $X \rightarrow 2^{Y}$ is said to be almost lower semi-continuous (a.l.s.c.) (resp. $n$-lower semi-continuous ( $n$-l.s.c.)) at $x_{0} \in X$ if for each $\varepsilon>0$ there is a neighbourhood $\mathscr{U}$ of $x_{0}$ such that $\cap\left\{B_{\varepsilon}(F(x)) \neq \varnothing: x \in \mathscr{U}\right\}$ (resp. $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{\varepsilon}\left(F\left(x_{i}\right)\right) \neq \varnothing$ for each choice of $n$ points $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$ in $\left.\mathscr{U}\right) . F$ is a.l.s.c. (resp. $n$-1.s.c.) if $F$ is a.l.s.c. (resp. $n$-l.s.c.) at each point $x$ of $X$.

For our purposes we give a slightly different
Definition. A multivalued mapping $F: X \rightarrow 2^{Y}$ is said to be finite lower semi-continuous (f.l.s.c.) at $x_{0}$ if for each $\varepsilon>0$ there is a neighbourhood $\mathscr{U}$ of $x_{0}$ such that for each finite set of points $A$ in $\mathscr{U} \cap_{x \in A} B_{\varepsilon}(F(x)) \neq \varnothing . F$ is f.l.s.c. if $F$ is f.l.s.c. at each point $x$ of $X$.

One of the main results in [7] is the following

Theorem (Deutsch and Kenderov). Let $X$ be a paracompact space and let $Y$ be a normed linear space. Suppose $F: X \rightarrow 2^{Y}$ has convex images. Then $F$ is a.l.s.c. if, and only if, for each $\varepsilon>0 F$ admits a continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selection.

The above theorem, as well as other topological results in [7], Deutsch and Kenderov apply to metric projections. Recall that a map $P_{M}: X \rightarrow 2^{M}$, where $M \subseteq X$ and $X$ is normed, is referred to as the metric projection generated by $M$ provided that for each $x \in X$

$$
P_{M}(x)=\{y \in M:\|y-x\|=d(x, M)\}
$$

where

$$
d(x, M)=\inf \{\|x-z\|: z \in M\}
$$

is the distance function generated by $M$. A set $M$ is called proximinal if $P_{M}(x) \neq \varnothing$ for all $x$ in $X$. It is well known that the proximinal sets are closed.

Various problems concerning existence or non-existence of continuous selections for metric projections are studied in $[1-3,7,10,12-15,18,19]$ and others. Closely related to [7] is the work of Beer [1]. We note that the notion of approximate selection in $[2,4,5,16,17]$ bears a different meaning.

This paper is motivated by the work of Deutsch and Kenderov [7]. It contains two results. The first one gives a characterization of reflexivity: A Banach space $X$ is reflexive if, and only if, for every equivalent norm in $X$ every f.l.s.c. metric projection generated by a proximinal subset of $X$ has continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selections for each $\varepsilon>0$. The second result
shows that almost lower semi-continuity of a metric projection does not imply existence of a continuous selection, even for finite dimensions: In a five-dimensional Minkowskian space there is an a.l.s.c. metric projection, generated by a three-dimensional subspace, which fails to possess a continuous selection.

## 2. The Main Resuly

Theorem 1. Let $X$ be a non-reflexive Banach space and $M \subseteq X$ be a closed subspace with $\operatorname{codim}(M)=2$. Then there is an equivalent renorming of $X$ such that $M$ is proximinal and the metric projection $P_{M}: X \rightarrow 2^{M}$ is finite lower semi-continuous but not almost lower semi-continuous.

Proof. Since $M$ is closed and $\operatorname{codim}(M)=2$, then $M$ is non-reflexive itself, and $X$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times M$. We will define an equivalent norm in the space $Z:=\mathbb{R}^{2} \times M$. Suppose $f \in M^{*}$ is a bounded linear functional with $\|f\|=1$ which does not achieve its supremum on the closed unit ball $U(M)$. The existence of such a functional is ensured by the theorem of James [9].

Consider the sets

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C=\left\{(r, s, \eta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times M: s=\langle f, \eta\rangle, r^{2}+s^{2} \leqslant 1,\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\} \\
& D=\left\{(0, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times M:|t| \leqslant 1,\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ is the dual pairing between $M$ and $M^{*}$. Obviously, $C$ and $D$ are closed convex bounded and symmetric. Designate by $V$ the closed convex hull of $C \cup D$, i.e., $V=\overline{\operatorname{co}}(C \cup D)$. Then $V$ is a closed convex bounded and symmetric set. Also, it has non-empty interior: If $C_{1}$ is the set $\{(r, 0,0)$ : $|\eta| \leqslant 1\}$, then $2^{-1}\left(C_{1}+D\right)=\left\{(r / 2, t / 2, \eta / 2):|r| \leqslant 1,|t| \leqslant 1,\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\}$ has non-empty interior. On the other hand the latter set is properly contained in $V$.

Now $V$ viewed as a unit ball defines an equivalent norm $\|\cdot\|$ in $Z$. Let $P_{M}: Z \rightarrow 2^{M}$ be the metric projection generated by $M$ with respect to the $V$-norm,

For arbitrary $q \in[0,2 \pi)$, let $a_{q}=(\cos q, \sin q, 0) \in Z$. Our next goal is to determine the set $P_{M}\left(a_{q}\right)$. Notice that the orthogonal projections of $C$ and $D$ over $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ are both contained in the circle $\left\{(r, s, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \times M: r^{2}+s^{2} \leqslant 1\right\}$. Since it is closed, the orthogonal projection of $V$ is in the same circle too. Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
d\left(a_{q}, M\right) \geqslant 1 . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote by $m_{q}$ the affine set $\{(\cos q, \sin q, \eta) \in Z: \eta \in M\}, q \in[0,2 \pi)$. It follows from (1) that $m_{q}$ does not intersect the interior of $V$. If we show
that $V \cap n_{q} \neq \varnothing$, then the formula $P_{M}\left(a_{q}\right)=\left(a_{q}+V\right) \cap M$ will take place. Towards this end, suppose first that $q \neq \pi / 2$ and that $q \neq 3 \pi / 2$. In this situation $m_{q} \cap D=\varnothing$. Moreover, both sets are separated by the functional $(\cos q, \sin q, 0) \in Z^{*}$. So are $m_{q}$ and $C$. In order to prove that $V \cap m_{q}=$ $C \cap m_{q}$, we need the following

Lemma 1. Let $C, D$, and $H$ be closed convex subsets of a normed space $X$, and let $g \in X^{*}$ be a bounded linear functional such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup \{\langle g, y\rangle: y \in D\}= & \alpha<\beta=\inf \{\langle g, z\rangle: z \in H\}, \quad \text { and } \\
& \sup \{\langle g, x\rangle: x \in C\} \leqslant \beta .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $H \cap \overline{\mathrm{co}}(C \cup D)=H \cap C$.
Proof. Obviously $H \cap C \subseteq H \cap \overline{\operatorname{co}}(C \cup D)$. Let $z \in H, z=\lim z_{n}, z_{n}=$ $\lambda_{n} x_{n}+(1-\lambda) y_{n}$ where $\left(x_{n}\right) \subseteq C,\left(y_{n}\right) \subseteq D,\left(\lambda_{n}\right) \subset[0,1]$. Choose a convergent subsequence of $\left(\lambda_{n}\right)$. With abuse of notation, let $\lambda_{n} \rightarrow \lambda_{0}$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \beta \leqslant\langle g, z\rangle \leqslant \lambda_{0} \overline{\lim }\left\langle g, x_{n}\right\rangle+\left(1-\lambda_{0}\right) \overline{\lim }\left\langle g, y_{n}\right\rangle \\
& \quad \leqslant \lambda_{0} \beta+\left(1-\lambda_{0}\right) \alpha \leqslant \lambda_{0} \beta+\left(1-\lambda_{0}\right) \beta=\beta .
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies $\lambda_{0}=1$, whence $z=\lim x_{n}$. Therefore $z \in C$ because $C$ is closed. The proof is completed.

By Lemma $1 V \cap m_{q}=C \cap m_{q}$. So

$$
\begin{align*}
V \cap m_{q}= & \{(\cos q, \sin q, 0) \in Z:\langle f, \eta\rangle \\
& \left.=\sin q,\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\}, \quad q \neq \pi / 2,3 \pi / 2 \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

The explicit form of $V \cap m_{q}$ convinces us that $V$ and $m_{q}$ have a nonempty intersection.

For $q=\pi / 2$ we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
V \cap m_{\pi / 2} \supseteq D \cap m_{\pi / 2}=\left\{(0,1, \eta) \in Z:\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Analogously, for $q=3 \pi / 2$

$$
\begin{equation*}
V \cap m_{3 \pi / 2} \supseteq D \cap m_{3 \pi / 2}=\{(0,-1, \eta) \in Z:\|\eta\| \leqslant 1\} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is a routine matter to verify that $P_{M}\left(a_{q}\right)=\left(a_{q}+V\right) \cap M=$ $a_{q}+V \cap\left(-m_{q}\right)$, whence by (2)-(4) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
P_{M}\left(a_{q}\right) & =\{(0,0, \eta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times M:\langle f, \eta\rangle \\
& \left.=-\sin q,\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\}, \quad q \notin\{\pi / 2,3 \pi / 2\} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

as well as

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{M}\left(a_{\pi / 2}\right) \supseteq\left\{(0,0, \eta) \in \mathbb{Z}:\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{M}\left(a_{3 \pi / 2}\right) \supseteq\left\{(0,0, \eta) \in Z:\|\eta\|_{M} \leqslant 1\right\} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this way, for the points of the circumference $E=\{(\cos q, \sin q, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}$ : $q \in[0,2 \pi)\}, q \notin\{\pi / 2,3 \pi / 2\}$, the images of $P_{M}$ correspond to the level-sets of $f$ intersected by the closed unit ball $U(M)$, while for $q=\pi / 2$ or $q=3 \pi / 2$, $U(M)$ is contained in $P_{M}\left(a_{q}\right)$.

We claim now that the restriction of $P_{M}$ over $E$ is finite lower semi-continuous. The claim is almost obvious; however, for the sake of completeness, we give a demonstration in the particular case $q_{0}=\pi / 2$ (for arbitrary $q$ the proof is similar).

Fix $\varepsilon>0(\varepsilon<\pi / 2)$ and take an open neighbourhood $\mathscr{U}$ in $\mathcal{Z}, a_{q_{0}} \in \mathscr{U}$, such that for arbitrary $a_{q}=(\cos q, \sin q, 0), a_{q} \in \mathscr{U}$, it follows that $|q-\pi / 2|<\varepsilon$. Let $\left(a_{q_{i}}\right)_{i=1}^{n} \in \mathscr{U}$ and $k$ is an index satisfying $\left|q_{k}-\pi / 2\right|=$ $\min \left\{\left|q_{i}-\pi / 2\right|: i=1,2, \ldots, n\right\}$. Suppose $q_{k} \neq \pi / 2$ (the case $q_{k}=q_{0}$ is trivial) and take $y \in P_{M}\left(a_{q_{k}}\right)$. Then $\langle f, y\rangle=-\sin q_{k}$. For each $i$ choose $\hat{\lambda}_{i}$, $0<\lambda_{i} \leqslant 1$, such that $\left\langle f, \lambda_{i} y\right\rangle=-\sin q_{i}$, and define $y_{i}=\lambda_{i} y$. Since $y_{i}$ belongs to $P_{M}\left(a_{q_{i}}\right)$, we have the estimation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|y-y_{i}\right\| & =\left(1-\lambda_{i}\right)\|y\| \leqslant 1-\hat{\lambda}_{i} \\
& =1-\frac{\sin q_{i}}{\sin q_{k}}<1-\sin q_{i} \leqslant\left|\pi / 2-q_{i}\right|<\varepsilon .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $\cap_{i=1}^{n} B_{\varepsilon}\left(P_{M}\left(a_{q_{i}}\right)\right) \neq \varnothing$, i.e., $P_{M \mid E}$ is f.l.s.c. at $a_{q 0}$. Our next lemma implies that $P_{M}$ is everywhere f.l.s.c.

Lemma 2. Let $Z=(Y \times M,\|\cdot\|)$ be a product space of two Banach spaces $Y$ and $M$, and let $P_{M}$ be the metric projection generated by $M$ (i.e., by $\{0\} \times M)$. If for $E=\left\{(y, 0) \in Z:\|y\|_{Y}=1\right\}$ the restriction $\operatorname{map} P_{M \mid E}$ is a.l.s.c. (respectively f.l.s.c.) and has non-empty images, then so is $P_{M}$.

Proof. For arbitrary $z \in Z$ the representation $z=\lambda y+m$ holds, where $\lambda \geqslant 0, y \in Y,\|y\|_{Y}=1, m \in M$. We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{M}(z)=m+\lambda \cdot P_{M}(y) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Designate the closed unit ball of $Z$ by $V$ and suppose $d(y, M)=$ $r>0$. Then $m+\lambda P_{M}(y)=m+\lambda(M \cap(y+r V))=m+M \cap(\lambda y+\lambda r V)=$ $M \cap(z+\lambda r V)$. Now since for any $k \in(0, r) M \cap(y+k V)=\varnothing$, then $M \cap(z+\lambda k V)=\varnothing$. Therefore $d(z, M)=\lambda r$, which establishes the claim. In particular, (8) implies $P_{M}(z) \neq \varnothing$.

We next prove that $P_{M}$ is a.l.s.c. at $z_{0}$ where $z_{0}$ is an arbitrary point in $Z$ (the case of f.l.s.c. is treated analogously). If $z_{0}=m_{0} \in M$, then for each $z \in B_{\varepsilon / 2}\left(m_{0}\right)$ and each $m \in P_{M}(z)$

$$
\left\|m_{0}-m\right\| \leqslant\left\|m_{0}-z\right\|+\|z-m\| \leqslant 2 \cdot\left\|m_{0}-z\right\|<\varepsilon,
$$

whence $\cap\left\{B_{\varepsilon}\left(P_{M}(z)\right):\left\|z-z_{0}\right\|<\varepsilon / 2\right\} \neq \varnothing$. So let $z_{0}=\lambda y_{0}+m_{0}, \lambda_{0}>0$, $\left\|y_{0}\right\|_{Y}=1, m_{0} \in M$. Since $P_{M \mid E}$ is a.l.s.c. at $y_{0}$, there exist $\delta>0$ and $u_{0} \in Z$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{0} \in \bigcap\left\{B_{\varepsilon / 3 \lambda_{0}}\left(P_{M}(y)\right): y \in E,\left\|y-y_{0}\right\|<\delta\right\} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously, we can always assume that $\left\|u_{0}\right\|>0$. Consider the open neighbourhood of $z_{0}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{U}= & \left\{\lambda y+m:\left|\lambda-\lambda_{0}\right|<\min \left\{\varepsilon / 4\left\|u_{0}\right\|, \lambda_{0} / 2\right\},\right. \\
& \left.y \in E,\left\|y-y_{0}\right\|<\delta, m \in M,\left\|m-m_{0}\right\|<\varepsilon / 4\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Suppose $z \in \mathscr{U}, z=\lambda y+m$, and take in (9) a point $u \in P_{M}(y)$ such that $\left\|u-u_{0}\right\|<\varepsilon / 3 \lambda_{0}$. According to (8) $\lambda u+m \in P_{M}(z)$. It follows from

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\lambda u+m-\lambda_{0} u_{0}-m_{0}\right\| & \leqslant \lambda\left\|u-u_{0}\right\|+\left|\lambda-\lambda_{0}\right| \cdot\left\|u_{0}\right\|+\left\|m-m_{0}\right\| \\
& <\varepsilon \lambda / 3 \lambda_{0}+\varepsilon / 2<\varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

that $\lambda_{0} u_{0}+m_{0} \in \cap\left\{B_{\varepsilon}\left(P_{M}(z)\right): z \in \mathscr{U}\right\}$, and this completes the proof.
In this way, for an arbitrary bounded linear functional $f \in M^{*}$ not achieving its norm, we defined an equivalent norm in $Z$ with respect to which $M$ is proximinal and $P_{M}$ is f.l.s.c. Now $f$ is chosen in a more sophisticated manner so that $P_{M}$ fails to be a.l.s.c. In doing so we employ a theorem of James. But, before that, we make some explanatory remarks.

Suppose $\left(g_{n}\right) \subset M^{*}$ is a sequence of bounded linear functionals. Denote by $L\left(g_{n}\right)$ the set

$$
\left\{w \in M^{*}: \underline{\lim }\left\langle g_{n}, x\right\rangle \leqslant\langle w, x\rangle \leqslant \overline{\lim }\left\langle g_{n}, x\right\rangle, \forall x \in M\right\}
$$

and observe that $L\left(g_{n}\right)$ is non-empty. Indeed, the mapping $T: M \rightarrow l_{\infty}$, $T(x)=\left(\left\langle g_{n}, x\right\rangle\right)$, associates with each $x \in M$ a bounded sequence. If $\varphi \in l_{\infty}^{*}$ is a Banach limit, then $\underline{\lim }\left\langle g_{n}, x\right\rangle \leqslant \varphi(T(x)) \leqslant \overline{\lim }\left\langle g_{n}, x\right\rangle$ whence $w(\cdot)=\varphi(T(\cdot)) \in M^{*}$.

For arbitrary $f \in M^{*},\|f\|=1$, denote

$$
S(f, \gamma)=\{x \in U(M):\{f, x\rangle=\gamma\}, \quad 0<\gamma<1
$$

It follows from (5-7) and Lemma 2 that $P_{M \mid E}$ is a.l.s.c. at $(0,-1,0) \in Z$ if, and only if,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall \varepsilon>0 \exists \gamma_{0} \in(0,1): \bigcap_{\gamma \geqslant \gamma_{0}} B_{\varepsilon}(S(f, \gamma)) \neq \varnothing \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the next theorem we show that in a non-reflexive Banach space there exists a functional $f$ which does not satisfy (10).

Theorem (James [9], [8, p. 12]). Suppose M is a non-reflexive Banach space. Then for $\theta \in(0,1)$ and $\lambda_{n}>0, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}=1$, there exist $\alpha, \theta \leqslant \alpha \leqslant 2$, and $\left(g_{n}\right) \subset M^{*},\left\|g_{n}\right\| \leqslant 1$, such that each $w \in L\left(g_{n}\right)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}\left(g_{n}-w\right)\right\| \leqslant \alpha \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\sum_{n=1}^{k} \lambda_{n}\left(g_{n}-w\right)\right\| \leqslant \alpha \cdot\left(1-\theta \cdot \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}\right), \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Pick $\theta \in(0,1)$ and choose $\delta>0$ so that $\delta<\theta^{2} / 2$. If $\lambda_{1}=1-\delta$, $\lambda_{n+1}=\delta \lambda_{n}$, then $\lambda_{n}>0, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}=1$, and according to the theorem of James there exist $\alpha, \theta \leqslant \alpha \leqslant 2$, and $\left(g_{n}\right) \subset M^{*},\left\|g_{n}\right\| \leqslant 1$, such that each $w$, $w \in L\left(g_{n}\right)$, satisfies (11) and (12).

For an arbitrary fixed functional $w, w \in L\left(g_{n}\right)$, take $f=$ $\alpha^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}\left(g_{n}-w\right)$ where $\|f\|=1$. We claim that $f$ does not satisfy $(10)$. Assume the contrary. Then for $0<\varepsilon<(\alpha \theta-2 \delta) / 2 \cdot \delta /(1-\delta)$ there are $x_{\varepsilon} \in U(M)$ and $\gamma_{0} \in(0,1)$ such that $x_{\varepsilon} \in B_{\varepsilon}(S(f, \gamma))$ whenever $\gamma \in\left(\gamma_{0}, 1\right)$. Since $\underline{\lim }\left\langle g_{n}, x_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle \leqslant\left\langle w, x_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle$, there is $k$ so that

$$
\left\langle g_{k}-w, x_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle<\alpha \theta-2 \delta .
$$

Estimate $\langle f, x\rangle$ for $x \in U(M),\left\|x-x_{\varepsilon}\right\| \leqslant \varepsilon$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha\langle f, x\rangle= & \left\langle\sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \lambda_{n}\left(g_{n}-w\right), x\right\rangle+\lambda_{k}\left\langle g_{k}-w, x-x_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle \\
& +\lambda_{k}\left\langle g_{k}-w, x_{\varepsilon}\right\rangle+\left\langle\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}\left(g_{n}-w\right), x\right\rangle \\
\leqslant & \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{k-1} \lambda_{n}\left(g_{n}-w\right)\right\|+2 \varepsilon \lambda_{k} \\
& +(\alpha \theta-2 \delta) \lambda_{k}+2 \cdot \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n} \\
\leqslant & \alpha \cdot\left(1-\theta \cdot \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}\right)+2 \varepsilon \lambda_{k} \\
& +(\alpha \theta-2 \delta) \lambda_{k}+2 \delta \cdot \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \lambda_{n} \\
= & \alpha-(\alpha \theta-2 \delta) \cdot \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}+2 \varepsilon \lambda_{k} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle f, x\rangle \leqslant 1-c, \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
c=\alpha^{-1}\left[(\alpha \theta-2 \delta) \cdot \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}-2 \varepsilon \lambda_{k}\right] .
$$

Since $\varepsilon$ is sufficiently small, then

$$
c>\alpha^{-1}(\alpha \theta-2 \delta) \cdot\left[\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{n}-\frac{\delta \lambda_{k}}{1-\delta}\right]=0
$$

It follows from (13) that $B_{\varepsilon}\left(x_{\varepsilon}\right) \cap S(f, \gamma)=\varnothing$ whenever $\gamma>1-c$ and this contradicts the choice of $x_{\varepsilon}$. Therefore $f$ does not satisfy (10). Therefore $P_{M}$ is not a.l.s.c. at $(0,-1,0) \in Z$. The proof of Theorem 1 is completed.

With the help of Theorem 1 and the theorem of Deutsch and Kenderov we give the following criterion for reflexivity:

Theorem 2. A Banach space $X$ is reflexive if, and only if, for every equivalent renorming of $X$ every finite lower semi-continuous metric projection generated by a convex proximinal subset of $X$ admits a continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selection for each $\varepsilon>0$.

Proof. Necessity. Let $(X,\|\cdot\|)$ be reflexive. Suppose $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm and $M$ is a convex subset of $X$ which is proximinal with respect to $|\cdot|$. Suppose also that the metric projection $P_{M}: X \rightarrow 2^{M}$ is f.l.s.c. The Banach space $(X,|\cdot|)$ is reflexive and $M$ is closed. We recall that in a reflexive space a convex set is proximinal if, and only if, it is closed. For arbitrary $x \in(X,|\cdot|)$ and $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a neighbourhood $\mathscr{U}$ of $x$ such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} B_{\varepsilon / 2}\left(P_{M}\left(x_{i}\right) \neq \varnothing\right.$ for each $n$ and each choice of $n$ points $x_{1}$, $x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$. Now the family $\left\{\overline{B_{\varepsilon / 2}\left(P_{M}(z)\right)}: z \in \mathscr{U}\right\}$, whose elements are weakly compact sets, has the finite intersection property and then it has a nonempty intersection. Therefore $P_{M}$ is a.l.s.c. and according to the theorem of Deutsch and Kenderov $P_{M}$ admits a continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selection for each $\varepsilon>0$.

Sufficiency. Suppose $X$ is non-reflexive. It follows from Theorem 1 that there exist an equivalent norm $|\cdot|$ and a convex proximinal set $M \subset X$ such that the metric projection $P_{M}: X \rightarrow 2^{M}$ is f.l.s.c. with respect to $|\cdot|$, but it lacks a.l.s.c. Apply the theoerem of Deutsch and Kenderov again, the sufficiency part, to prove that for some $\varepsilon>0 P_{M}$ fails to admit a continuous $\varepsilon$-approximate selection.

## 3. Example of an a.l.s.c. Metric Projection, Generated by a Three-Dimensional Subspace of a Five-Dimensional Space, which Does Not Have a Continuous Selection

In the sequel $S^{n}$ and $B^{n}$ will stand for the unit sphere and the closed unit ball of the $n$-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, respectively. The Euclidean norm is denoted by $|\cdot|$.
The following simple example of an a.l.s.c. u.s.c. mapping $\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}$ which fails to admit a continuous selection has motivated our further considerations. The example is a modification of an analogous example due to Ch. Dangalchev [6]. Earlier examples of the same nature, but without upper semi-continuity involved, have been constructed by Pelant, c.f. [7], and Beer [1].

Suppose $\left(\theta_{n}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of positive reals so that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{n}=0$. Define another sequence $\left(\omega_{n}\right)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ by $\omega_{n}=2^{-1}\left(\theta_{n}+\theta_{n+1}\right)$. The points $P_{n}$ and $Q_{n}$ have coordinates ( $\omega_{n}, 1$ ) and ( $\theta_{n},-1$ ), respectively. Denote by $\Delta_{n}$ the triangle [ $Q_{n}, P_{n}, Q_{n+1}$ ] for $n=1,2, \ldots$. The mapping $\phi$ is defined as follows: For $x \geqslant 0\left(x \leqslant \omega_{1}\right)$,

$$
\phi(x)= \begin{cases}\Delta_{n} & \text { if } \quad x=\omega_{n} \\ {\left[Q_{n},(x, 1)\right]} & \text { if } \quad \omega_{n}<x<\omega_{n-1} \\ {[(0,-1),(0,1)]} & \text { if } \quad x=0,\end{cases}
$$

and for $x<0 \phi(x)=-\phi(-x)$.
It is easily checked that $\phi$ is a.l.s.c. Suppose $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}$ is a selection for $\phi$ which is continuous at both $\omega_{n}$ and $-\omega_{n}$. Then $f\left(\omega_{n}\right)=P_{n}$ and $f\left(-\omega_{n}\right)=-P_{n}$. On the other hand $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n} \neq(0,0)$ and $f$ cannot be continuous at 0 .

We consider next a multivalued mapping $\tilde{\phi}$, in a certain sense similar to $\phi$, which admits a mechanical interpretation: The images of $\tilde{\phi}$ might be viewed as sets of contact when a cylinder-like solid is rolling over a plane.
Denote $D_{1}=\left\{(\cos \varphi, \sin \varphi, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}: \varphi \in[0,2 \pi)\right\}$ and $D_{2}=\{(\cos \varphi$, $\left.\sin \varphi,-1) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}: \varphi \in[0,2 \pi)\right\}$. Let $\gamma_{1}$ and $\gamma_{2}$ be the planes carried by $D_{1}$ and $D_{2}$, respectively. Suppose $\left(\theta_{n}\right)$ and $\left(\omega_{n}\right)$ are two strictly decreasing sequences both defined for every integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and satisfying $2 \omega_{n}=$ $\theta_{n}+\theta_{n+1}$. Moreover, suppose $\theta_{0}=\pi / 2, \theta_{-n}=\pi-\theta_{n}, \lim _{n \rightarrow-\infty} \theta_{n}=\pi$, $\lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \theta_{n}=0$. Then $\omega_{-n}=\pi-\omega_{n}, \lim _{n \rightarrow-\infty} \omega_{n}=\pi, \lim _{n \rightarrow+\infty} \omega_{n}=0$. Put $P_{n}=\left(\cos \omega_{n}, \sin \omega_{n}, 1\right)$ and $Q_{n}=\left(\cos \theta_{n}, \sin \theta_{n},-1\right)$. We now define a three-dimensional convex body $W$ by description of its surrounding surface $\Xi$ (see Fig. 1).

The segments $[(1,0,-1),(1,0,1)]$ and $[(-1,0,-1),(-1,0,1)]$ are part of $\Xi$. So are the triangles $A_{n}=\left[Q_{n}, P_{n}, Q_{n+1}\right]$. Let $C_{n}$ be the cones, with vertices $Q_{n}$, generated by $D_{1}$. The conical sectors $K_{n}$ which also


Fig. 1. The conical sectors are marked by dashed lines.
belong to $\Xi$ are cut off from $C_{n}$ by $\gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}$ and the planes through $A_{n-1}$ and $\Delta_{n}$. Observe that for each $n$ the plane supported by $\Delta_{n}$ meets $\gamma_{1}$ at a line $l_{n}$ which is a tangent to $D_{1}$ at $P_{n}$. Hence the planes through two adjoint triangles $\Delta_{n-1}$ and $\Delta_{n}$ are tangent to the surface of $C_{n}$, the segments [ $P_{n-1}, Q_{n}$ ] and $\left[Q_{n}, P_{n}\right.$ ] being generatrices for $C_{n}$. To complete the definition of $\Xi$ note that $X \in \Xi$ implies $-X \in \Xi$. Finally, define $W=\overline{\operatorname{co}} \Xi$.

Thus we have a closed convex bounded and symmetric set with nonempty interior. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the norm generated by $W$ via the Minkowski functional. Denote by $M$ the Minkowskian space ( $\mathbb{R}^{3},\|\cdot\|$ ).

For each point $x \in S^{3}$, with coordinates $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right),\left|x_{3}\right| \neq 1$, define $\pi(x)=\left(x_{1} / \sqrt{x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}}, \quad x_{2} / \sqrt{x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}}, \quad 0\right)$, i.e., $\pi$ projects $x$ along the "meridian" on the "equator" $E=\left\{\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}:{ }^{2} x_{1}+{ }^{2} x_{2}=1\right\}$.

It is clear from the definition of $W$ that for every $y=\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right) \in b d W$ with $\left|y_{3}\right| \neq 1$ there exists a uniquely determined normal vector $v(y) \in S^{3}$. Consider the set

$$
r=\left\{v(y) \in S^{3}: y=\left(y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right),\left|y_{3}\right| \neq 1,\|y\|=1\right\}
$$

which is symmetric since $W$ is symmetric itself. There is no difficulty in verifying that $E$ is a homeomorphic image of $r$ via $\pi$. Then $r$ might be viewed as a parametric curve with a parameter $\varphi$, where $\varphi$ is the oriented angle between the axis $O x_{1}$ and $\pi(v(y))$.

Denote by $h_{W}(\cdot)$ the support function generated by $W$, i.e., $h_{W}(x)=$ $\max \{\langle x, z\rangle: z \in W\}$. For each $x \in r$ let

$$
F_{x}=\left\{y \in W:\langle x, y\rangle=h_{W}(x)\right\} .
$$

Define $\tilde{\phi}$ as a composed map $E \rightarrow^{\pi^{-1}} r \rightarrow^{-F} W$, where $-F(x)=-\left(F_{x}\right)$ whenever $x \in r$. The images of $\bar{\phi}$ are the "contact sets" of $W$ and a plane "rolling" around $W$. Evidently, $\widetilde{\phi}$ is a.l.s.c. The absence of a continuous selection for $\tilde{\phi}$ is shown in the same way as this was done for the mapping $\phi$.

At the final stage of our construction we introduce a new norm in $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times M$ such that the metric projection $P_{M}: \mathbb{R}^{2} \times M \rightarrow 2^{M}$ restricted on the circumference $C=\left\{(\xi, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \times M:|\xi|=1\right\}$ is identical with $\bar{\phi}$.

For arbitrary $x \in r$ let

$$
G_{x}=\left\{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \times M: \xi=\pi(x), \eta \in F_{x}\right\}
$$

and define the new unit ball $V$ by the formula

$$
V=\overline{\mathrm{co}}\left(\bigcup_{x \in r} G_{x} \cup \frac{1}{2} B^{5}\right) .
$$

Obviously, $V$ is a closed bounded set with non-empty interior. It will suffice for symmetry to show that $\bigcup_{x \in r} G_{x}$ is symmetric. Indeed, if $(\xi, \eta) \in$ $\bigcup_{x \in r} G_{x}$, there is $x \in r$ such that $\xi=\pi(x)$ and $\eta \in F_{x}$. Since $W$ is symmetric, then $-\eta \in F_{-x}$. On the other hand $-\xi=\pi(-x)$ since $r$ is symmetric. Hence $(-\xi,-\eta) \in G_{-x}$ and $-x \in r$. Thus $V$ defines a norm in $\mathbb{R}^{2} \times M$ which we also denote by $\|\cdot\|$.

Identifying in notation $\{0\} \times M$ with $M$, let $P_{M}$ be the metric projection generated by the three-dimensional subspace $M$. We claim that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{M}(\xi, 0)=\{0\} \times F_{-x} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

whenever $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{2},|\xi|=1$ and $x=\pi^{-1}(\xi)$. The orthogonal projection along $M$ maps $V$ on $B^{2}$. For an arbitrary $\xi \in S^{2}$, denote $m_{\xi}=\{(\xi, \eta): \eta \in M\}$. It is clear that $d\left((0,0), m_{\xi}\right) \geqslant 1$. Suppose $\xi$ is a fixed point on $S^{2}$ and $\xi=\pi(x)$. We prove next

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{x}=m_{\xi} \cap V \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

The inclusion $G_{x} \subseteq m_{\xi} \cap V$ follows immediately. Conversely, if $(\xi, \eta) \in$ $m_{\xi} \cap V$, then $|\xi|=1$ and $(\xi, \eta)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\xi_{n}, \eta_{n}\right)$ where $\left(\xi_{n}, \eta_{n}\right) \in$ $\operatorname{co}\left(\cup_{x \in r} G_{x} \cup \frac{1}{2} B^{5}\right)$. According to the theorem of Caratheodory $\left(\xi_{n}, \eta_{n}\right)=$ $\sum_{i=1}^{6} \lambda_{n i}\left(\xi_{n i}, \eta_{n i}\right)$ where $0 \leqslant \lambda_{n i} \leqslant 1, \sum_{i=1}^{6} \lambda_{n i}=1,\left(\xi_{n i}, \eta_{n i}\right) \in \bigcup_{x \in r} G_{x i} \cup \frac{1}{2} B^{5}$, $n=1,2, \ldots, i=1, \ldots, 6$. We may assume, by passing to subsequences, that for every $i \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n i}=\lambda_{o i}$ and $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(\xi_{n i}, \eta_{n i}\right)=\left(\xi_{o i}, \eta_{o i}\right)$. So, with abuse of notation, we write

$$
(\xi, \eta)=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_{o i}\left(\xi_{o i}, \eta_{o i}\right), \lambda_{o i}>0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_{o i}=1, k \leqslant 6
$$

Since $\xi=\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_{o i} \xi_{o i}$ and $\left|\xi_{o i}\right| \leqslant 1$, we have from the strict convexity of $B^{2}$ that $\xi_{o i}=\xi$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, k$. Suppose $i$ is a fixed index. If ( $\xi_{n i}, \eta_{n i}$ ) were in $\frac{1}{2} B^{5}$ for infinitely many values for $n$, then $\xi_{o i}$ would belong to $\frac{1}{2} B^{5}$ too. But this is incompatible with our choice of $\xi$. So for large $n\left(\xi_{n i}, \eta_{n i}\right) \in \bigcup_{x \in r} G_{x}$. Therefore there exist uniquely determined points $x_{n i} \in S^{3}$ such that $\xi_{n i}=$ $\pi\left(x_{n i}\right), \eta_{n i} \in F_{x_{n i}}$ whence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle x_{n i}, \eta_{n i}\right\rangle=h_{W}\left(x_{n i}\right) . \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\pi$ is a homeomorphism, then $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n i}=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi^{-1}\left(\xi_{n i}\right)=$ $\pi^{-1}(\xi) \in r$. Taking $x=\pi^{-1}(\xi)$ and letting $n$ go to infinity in (16), we obtain $\left\langle x, \eta_{o i}\right\rangle=h_{W}(x)$. Notice that $\eta_{o i} \in W$ since $W$ is a closed set. On the other hand $x \in r$ and then $\eta_{o i} \in F_{x}, \xi=\pi(x)$. So $\left(\xi, \eta_{o i}\right) \in G_{x}$. It follows from the convexity of $G_{x}$ that $(\xi, \eta)=\left(\xi, \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_{o i} \eta_{o i}\right) \in G_{x}$. Thus (15) is established. In particular, (15) entails $d\left((0,0), m_{\xi}\right)=1$.

We proceed in determining the image of $P_{M}$ at $(\xi, 0)$ for $\xi \in S^{2}$. As was shown above $d((\xi, 0), M)=1$. Suppose $(z, y) \in[(\xi, 0)+V] \cap M$. Then $z=0$ and $(z, y)=(\xi, 0)+(-\xi, y)$ whence $(-\xi, y) \in V$. So $(\xi,-y) \in$ $m_{\xi} \cap V=G_{x}$ whenever $x=\pi^{-1}(\xi)$. We have $-y \in F_{x}$ which implies $y \in F_{-x}$. Thus $P_{M}(\xi, 0) \subseteq\left(0, F_{-x}\right)$ for $\xi=\pi(x)$. Conversely, suppose $(0, y) \in\left(0, F_{-x}\right)$ where $\xi=\pi(x)$. It follows from the representation $(0, y)=(\xi, 0)+(-\xi, y)$ that $(-\xi, y) \in G_{-x} \subseteq V$ because $-\xi \in \pi(-x)$. On the other hand obviously $(0, y) \in M$. The proof of our claim (14) is completed.

Finally, notice that since the restriction of $P_{M}$ on the circumference $C$ behaves like the mapping $\tilde{\phi}$, we need only apply Lemma 2 in order to make sure that $P_{M}$ satisfies the required properties.
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