

# LOCAL UNIFORM CONVEXITY OF DAY'S NORM ON $c_0(\Gamma)$

JOHN RAINWATER

**1. Introduction.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a nonempty set and let  $c_0(\Gamma)$  denote the Banach space (supremum norm) of all real-valued functions  $x$  on  $\Gamma$  such that for each  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\{\gamma \in \Gamma : |x(\gamma)| \geq \epsilon\}$  is finite. This space has received renewed interest because of a powerful mapping theorem of Lindenstrauss [4]: If  $E$  is a reflexive Banach space, then there exist a set  $\Gamma$  and a continuous one-to-one linear map  $T$  of  $E$  into  $c_0(\Gamma)$ . More generally, Amir and Lindenstrauss [1] have shown that if a Banach space  $E$  is the closed linear span of a weakly compact subset of  $E$  (i.e., if  $E$  is weakly compactly generated), then there exist such a set  $\Gamma$  and mapping  $T$ . The existence of such a map, together with Day's theorem [3] that  $c_0(\Gamma)$  admits an equivalent strictly convex norm, makes it easy to show that every weakly compactly generated Banach space admits an equivalent strictly convex norm [1].

Consider, now, a stronger property than strict convexity; that of *local uniform convexity*:

(LUC) If  $\|x_n\| = 1 = \|x\|$  and  $\|x_n + x\| \rightarrow 2$ , then  $\|x_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$ .

The main purpose of this note is to prove that a certain function on  $c_0(\Gamma)$  defined by Day [3] is actually an equivalent (LUC) norm for  $c_0(\Gamma)$ . In §3 this fact is combined with the Lindenstrauss mapping theorem to obtain a new renorming result for reflexive Banach spaces.

The author wishes to thank Professors E. Asplund, M. Kadec, J. Lindenstrauss, A. Pełczyński, R. Phelps and S. Troyanskii for helpful discussions concerning the subject matter of this paper.

**2. Proof of the main result.** We first recall the norm on  $c_0(\Gamma)$  defined by Day. If  $x \in c_0(\Gamma)$ , then  $x$  has countable support  $E(x) = \{\alpha_k\}$ , which can be enumerated so that  $|x(\alpha_k)| \geq |x(\alpha_{k+1})|$ ,  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ . Define  $D: c_0(\Gamma) \rightarrow l_2(\Gamma)$  by

$$(Dx)(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \frac{x(\alpha_k)}{2^k} & \text{if } \gamma \in E(x) \\ 0 & \text{if } \gamma \notin E(x). \end{cases}$$

Although  $D$  is nonlinear, the function  $p(x) = \|Dx\|_{l_2}$ , ( $x \in c_0(\Gamma)$ ) is a norm on  $c_0(\Gamma)$ . (It follows easily from the definition that  $p(rx)$

---

Received by the editors September 18, 1968.

$= |r| p(x)$ ; we prove the triangle inequality below.) Since  $|x(\alpha_k)| = \|x\|$ , we see that  $\|x\|/2 \leq p(x) \leq \|x\|/\sqrt{3}$ , ( $x \in c_0(\Gamma)$ ), so  $p$  is equivalent to the supremum norm on  $c_0(\Gamma)$ .

We next observe the following identity: If  $s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$  and  $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$  and if  $\beta$  is any permutation of the positive integers, then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_k t_k - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_k t_{\beta(k)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (s_k - s_{k+1}) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^k t_i - \sum_{i=1}^k t_{\beta(i)} \right]$$

We can draw two conclusions from this:

$$(1) \quad \sum_k s_k t_k \geq \sum_k s_k t_{\beta(k)}, \text{ and}$$

(2) For each integer  $m$ ,  $\sum_k s_k t_k - \sum_k s_k t_{\beta(k)} \geq (s_m - s_{m+1})(t_m - t_{m+1})$  or  $\beta$  permutes  $1, 2, \dots, m$  onto itself.

Conclusion (1) follows from the fact that  $\sum_k t_i \geq \sum_k t_{\beta(i)}$ , for each  $k$ , while (2) is immediate from the fact that if  $\{\beta(i)\}_{i=1}^m \neq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , then  $t_1 + t_2 + \dots + t_{m-1} + t_{m+1} \geq \sum_{i=1}^m t_{\beta(i)}$ .

It follows from (1) that if  $x \in c_0(\Gamma)$ , with  $E(x) = \{\alpha_k\}$  (so that  $\{|x(\alpha_k)|\}$  is nonincreasing), then

$$(3) \quad p(x)^2 \geq \sum 4^{-k} |x(\beta_k)|^2$$

for any permutation  $\{\beta_k\}$  of  $\{\alpha_k\}$ . In fact, (3) holds for any sequence  $\{\beta_k\}$  from  $\Gamma$ , since if  $\beta_k \notin E(x)$ , then we have introduced a zero term on the right side. This inequality allows us to prove the triangle inequality for  $p$ :

If  $x, y$  are in  $c_0(\Gamma)$ , let  $E(x) = \{\alpha_k\}$ ,  $E(y) = \{\beta_k\}$  and  $E(x+y) = \{\gamma_k\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} p(x+y) &= (\sum 4^{-k}(x+y)(\gamma_k)^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq (\sum 4^{-k}x(\gamma_k)^2)^{1/2} + (\sum 4^{-k}y(\gamma_k)^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq (\sum 4^{-k}x(\alpha_k)^2)^{1/2} + (\sum 4^{-k}y(\beta_k)^2)^{1/2} = p(x) + p(y). \end{aligned}$$

To prove that  $p$  is (LUC), suppose that  $p(x+x_n) \rightarrow 2p(x)$  and  $p(x_n) \rightarrow p(x)$ ; we must show that  $p(x-x_n) \rightarrow 0$ . To this end, let  $E(x) = \{\alpha_k\}$ ,  $E(x_n) = \{\alpha_k^n\}$ , and  $E(x+x_n) = \{\beta_k^n\}$ , and consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} (4) \quad &2p(x)^2 + 2p(x_n)^2 - p(x+x_n)^2 \\ &= \sum 4^{-k}[2x(\alpha_k)^2 + 2x_n(\alpha_k^n)^2 - (x+x_n)(\beta_k^n)^2] \\ &\geq \sum 4^{-k}[2x(\beta_k^n)^2 + 2x_n(\beta_k^n)^2 - (x+x_n)(\beta_k^n)^2] \\ &= \sum 4^{-k}[x(\beta_k^n) - x_n(\beta_k^n)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the quantity in the first line converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that

$$(5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [x(\beta_k^n) - x_n(\beta_k^n)] = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots.$$

Suppose, now, that  $p(x_n - x) \rightarrow 0$ . Then there exists a subsequence (which we still denote by  $\{x_n\}$ ) and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\|x_n - x\| \geq \epsilon$  for each  $n$ . Let  $K$  be the largest integer which satisfies  $|x(\alpha_K)| \geq \epsilon/16$ . Then  $|x(\alpha_{K+1})| < \epsilon/16 \leq |x(\alpha_K)|$  and hence

$$0 < \delta = 2(4^{-K} - 4^{-K-1})(|x(\alpha_K)|^2 - |x(\alpha_{K+1})|^2).$$

If  $n$  is large enough that the first line of (4) is less than  $\delta$ , then the second and third lines differ by less than  $\delta$ , so that

$$\sum 4^{-k} 2x(\alpha_k)^2 - \sum 4^{-k} 2x(\beta_k^n)^2 < \delta.$$

From (2) it is readily seen that this is possible only if  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K = \{\beta_k^n\}_{k=1}^K$  for all large  $n$ . By choosing a subsequence, we can assume that  $\beta_k^n = \beta_k$  for each  $n$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ . From (5) it follows that  $x_n(\beta_k) \rightarrow x(\beta_k)$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ , and since  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K = \{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^K$  we have  $x_n \rightarrow x$  pointwise (hence uniformly) on the finite set  $A = \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K$ .

For each  $n$  choose  $\gamma_n$  in  $\Gamma$  such that  $|x(x_n)(\gamma_n)| = \|x - x_n\| \geq \epsilon$ . By what we have just shown (and by the hypothesis  $p(x_n) \rightarrow p(x)$ ) we can choose  $N$  large enough such that

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} |(x - x_n)(\alpha)| &< \epsilon & \text{if } \alpha \in A, n \geq N \\ x(\alpha)^2 - x_n(\alpha)^2 &< \epsilon^2 4^{-K-4} & \text{if } \alpha \in A, n \geq N \\ p(x_n)^2 - p(x)^2 &< \epsilon^2 4^{-K-4} & \text{if } n \geq N. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $\gamma_n \notin A$ . If we replace  $E(x_n) = \{\alpha_k^n\}$  by a sequence which starts with  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K, \gamma_n$ , then (3) implies that

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} p(x_n)^2 &= \sum \frac{x_n(\alpha_k^n)^2}{4^k} \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{x_n(\alpha_k)^2}{4^k} + \frac{x_n(\gamma_n)^2}{4^{K+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since  $|x(\alpha)| < \epsilon 4^{-2}$  if  $\alpha \notin A$  and since  $\sum_{K+1}^\infty 4^{-k} = (3 \cdot 4^K)^{-1}$ , we have

$$(8) \quad p(x)^2 < \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{x(\alpha_k)^2}{4^k} + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{4^2}\right)^2 \frac{1}{4^K \cdot 3}.$$

Using (7), then (8), and then (6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x_n(\gamma_n)^2}{4^{K+1}} &\leq p(x_n)^2 - p(x)^2 + p(x)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{x_n(\alpha_k)^2}{4^k} \\ &< p(x_n)^2 - p(x)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{x(\alpha_k)^2 - x_n(\alpha_k)^2}{4^k} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4^4} \cdot \frac{1}{4^K \cdot 3} \\ &< \epsilon^2 4^{-K-3} \quad \text{if } n \geq N. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if  $n \geq N$ , we have (from (6))  $|x - x_n)(\gamma_n)| < \epsilon$  if  $\gamma_n \in A$  and  $|x - x_n)(\gamma_n)| \leq |x(\gamma_n)| + |x_n(\gamma_n)| < 4^{-2}\epsilon + 4^{-1}\epsilon < \epsilon$  if  $\gamma_n \notin A$ , a contradiction which completes the proof.

**3. A renorming theorem.** It is an interesting open question whether every reflexive Banach space can be given an equivalent (LUC) norm. This is known [2, Proposition 2] to be equivalent to the problem of whether every such space can be given an equivalent Fréchet differentiable norm. (For related questions and results, see Asplund [2] and Lindenstrauss [5, §5].) The following result, however, is an easy consequence of the Lindenstrauss mapping theorem and the fact that Day's norm is (LUC).

**PROPOSITION.** *If  $E$  is a reflexive Banach space then  $E$  admits an equivalent norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$  which is weakly locally uniformly convex, i.e., which satisfies*

(WLUC) *If  $\|x_n\|_1 = 1 = \|x\|_1$  and  $\|x_n + x\|_1 \rightarrow 2$ , then  $x_n \rightarrow x$  weakly.*

Before proving this, we prove a simple lemma.

**LEMMA.** *Suppose that  $E$  is a linear space with two norms  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $|\cdot|$ , and that*

$$\|x\|_1 = (\|x\|^2 + |x|^2)^{1/2} \quad (x \in E).$$

*If  $\{x_n\} \subset E$  and  $x \in E$  are such that*

$$(*) \quad \|x_n\|_1 \rightarrow \|x\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_n + x\|_1 \rightarrow 2\|x\|_1$$

*then (\*) also holds for the norms  $\|\cdot\|$  and  $|\cdot|$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $a_n = (\|x_n\| + \|x\|)^2 - \|x_n + x\|^2$ ,  $b_n = (|x_n| + |x|)^2 - |x_n + x|^2$ ,  $c_n = (\|x_n\| - \|x\|)^2$  and  $d_n = (|x_n| - |x|)^2$ . Each of these is nonnegative and

$$\begin{aligned} a_n + b_n + c_n + d_n &= 2(\|x_n\|^2 + \|x\|^2 + |x_n|^2 + |x|^2) \\ &\quad - (\|x_n + x\|^2 + |x_n + x|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Our hypotheses imply that the right side converges to zero; hence each of the four sequences converges to zero.

We now prove the proposition. Let  $T:E \rightarrow c_0(\Gamma)$  be the map obtained from Lindenstrauss' theorem and let  $p$  be Day's norm on  $c_0(\Gamma)$ . Denoting the norm on  $E$  by  $\|\cdot\|$ , define

$$\|x\|_1 = (\|x\|^2 + [p(Tx)]^2)^{1/2}, \quad x \in E.$$

It is clear that  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is an equivalent norm on  $E$ . Suppose that  $\|x_n\|_1 = 1 = \|x\|_1$  and  $\|x+x_n\|_1 \rightarrow 2$ ; we want to show that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  weakly. By the lemma, we have  $p(Tx_n) \rightarrow p(Tx)$  and  $p(T(x+x_n)) = p(Tx+Tx_n) \rightarrow 2p(Tx)$ . Since  $p$  is (LUC), we have  $p(Tx_n - Tx) \rightarrow 0$ . Now, since the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  is bounded and  $E$  is reflexive, in order to show that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  weakly it suffices to show that if  $(x_\alpha)$  is a weakly convergent subnet of  $\{x_n\}$ , then  $\lim x_\alpha = x$ . But if  $x_\alpha \rightarrow y$  weakly, then  $Tx_\alpha \rightarrow Ty$  weakly; since  $Tx_n \rightarrow Tx$ , we have  $Tx_\alpha = Ty$ . Since  $T$  is one-to-one, we have  $x = y$ , and the proof is complete.

Lindenstrauss [5] has shown that the space  $l_\infty$  of all bounded sequences does not admit an equivalent (WLUC) norm, although it clearly admits a linear one-to-one continuous map into  $c_0$ .

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. D. Amir and J. Lindenstrauss, *The structure of weakly compact sets in Banach spaces*, Ann. of Math. 88 (1968), 35–46.
2. Edgar Asplund, *Fréchet differentiability of convex functions*, Acta Math. 121 (1968), 31–47.
3. M. M. Day, *Strict convexity and smoothness of normed spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 78 (1955), 516–528.
4. Joram Lindenstrauss, *On nonseparable reflexive Banach spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 72 (1966), 967–970.
5. ———, *Weakly compact sets—their topological properties and Banach spaces they generate*, Proc. Sympos. Infinite Dimensional Topology (1967), Ann. of Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J. (to appear).

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON