

SETS WHICH CAN BE EXTENDED TO m -CONVEX SETS

MARILYN BREEN

ABSTRACT. Let S be a compact set in R^d , $T_0 \subseteq S$. Then T_0 lies in an m -convex subset of S if and only if every finite subset of T_0 lies in an m -convex subset of S . For S a closed set in R^d and $T_0 \subseteq S$, let $T_1 = \{P: P$ a polytope in S having vertex set in T_0 , $\dim P < d - 1\}$. If for every three members of T_1 , at least one of the corresponding convex hulls

$$\text{conv}\{P_i \cup P_j\}, \quad 1 < i < j < 3.$$

lies in S , then T_0 lies in a 3-convex subset of S . An analogous result holds for m -convex sets provided $\ker S \neq \emptyset$.

1. Introduction. Let S be a subset of some linear topological space. The set S is said to be m -convex, $m \geq 2$, if and only if for every m -member subset of S , at least one of the $\binom{m}{2}$ line segments determined by these points lies in S . A point x in S is called a *point of local convexity* of S if and only if there is some neighborhood N of x such that if $y, z \in N \cap S$, then $[y, z] \subseteq S$. If S fails to be locally convex at some point q in S , then q is called a *point of local nonconvexity* (Inc point) of S .

Several interesting decomposition theorems have been obtained for closed m -convex sets in the plane (Valentine [5], Stamey and Marr [3], Breen and Kay [1]). However, for S a set in R^d and $T \subseteq S$, little work has been done to determine sufficient conditions under which T may be extended to an m -convex subset of S . Characterizations of this kind allow us to determine when T is contained in a starshaped subset of S for S compact [4] and similarly to determine when T lies in a union of k convex subsets of S (a variation of [2, Theorem 2]). Hence the purpose of this paper is to obtain an analogue of these results for m -convex sets.

The following familiar terminology will be used: Throughout the paper, $\text{conv } S$, $\text{cl } S$, and $\ker S$ will denote the convex hull, closure, and kernel, respectively, of the set S . Also, if S is convex, $\dim S$ will denote the dimension of S , and dist will denote the Euclidean metric for R^d .

2. A characterization theorem. Our first result will require the following easy lemma.

LEMMA 1. *If A is an m -convex set in R^d , then $(A)_p \equiv \{x: \text{dist}(A, x) < p\}$ is also m -convex for every $p > 0$.*

Received by the editors November 7, 1975.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 52A20, 52A35; Secondary 52A40.

Key words and phrases. m -convex sets.

© American Mathematical Society 1977

PROOF. Let x_1, \dots, x_m belong to $(A)_p$ for some $p > 0$. Then for each x_i , there is some y_i in A such that $\text{dist}(x_i, y_i) < p$. Since A is m -convex, one of the segments determined by the y points is in A , say $[y_1, y_2] \subseteq A$. But then for each λ , $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, $\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2$ lies in a p -neighborhood of $\lambda y_1 + (1 - \lambda)y_2$, so $\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 \in (A)_p$, and $[x_1, x_2] \subseteq (A)_p$.

THEOREM 1. Let S be a compact subset of R^d , $T \subseteq S$. Then T lies in an m -convex subset of S if and only if every finite subset of T lies in an m -convex subset of S .

PROOF. The necessity is obvious. The sufficiency will require the Hausdorff metric defined on the collection of compact subsets of S . Let $\mathcal{F} = \{A: A \text{ compact and } A \subseteq S\}$, and let d denote the Hausdorff metric for \mathcal{F} . That is, if $(A)_p = \{x: x \in S \text{ and } \text{dist}(x, A) < p\}$, then for A, B in \mathcal{F} ,

$$d(A, B) = \inf\{p: A \subseteq (B)_p \text{ and } B \subseteq (A)_p, p > 0\}.$$

Since S is bounded, it is easy to show that \mathcal{F} is bounded with respect to the Hausdorff metric, and standard arguments similar to those given in Valentine [4, pp. 37–39] may be used to show that (\mathcal{F}, d) has the Bolzano-Weierstrass property. That is, every infinite subset of \mathcal{F} has a limit point F in \mathcal{F} , and $F \neq \emptyset$.

Now for each x in T , define $\mathcal{C}_x = \{A: A \text{ compact and } m\text{-convex, with } x \in A \subseteq S\}$. It is easy to see that the collection of \mathcal{C}_x sets has the finite intersection property: For $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_k$ any finite collection of these sets, with x_1, \dots, x_k the corresponding members of T , by hypothesis there is some m -convex subset B of S containing x_1, \dots, x_k . Standard arguments show that $\text{cl } B$ is m -convex, and since S is compact, $\text{cl } B$ is a compact subset of S . Hence $\text{cl } B \in \mathcal{C}_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$.

Furthermore, we assert that each \mathcal{C}_x set is compact, and clearly it suffices to show that every infinite subset $\{A_n\}$ in \mathcal{C}_x has a limit point in \mathcal{C}_x . Since $\mathcal{C}_x \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, by our opening paragraph $\{A_n\}$ has a limit point $A \neq \emptyset$ in \mathcal{F} , so it remains to show that A is m -convex and $x \in A$.

Without loss of generality, assume that $\lim A_n = A$. That is,

$$\lim d(A_n, A) = 0.$$

Select a sequence $\{p_n\}$ of positive numbers converging to zero so that $d(A_n, A) < p_n$ for each n . Then $A \subseteq (A_n)_{p_n}$ and $A_n \subseteq (A)_{p_n}$. Select points x_1, \dots, x_m in A . By the Lemma, since A_n is m -convex, $(A_n)_{p_n}$ is m -convex, so for each n , there exists some pair $y(n), z(n)$ in $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ such that $[y(n), z(n)] \subseteq (A_n)_{p_n}$. Hence one of the $\binom{m}{2}$ pairs from $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ appears infinitely many times, and we may choose a subsequence I of natural numbers and a pair y_0, z_0 in $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ so that $[y_0, z_0] \subseteq (A_n)_{p_n}$ for all $n \in I$. Then

$$[y_0, z_0] \subseteq (A_n)_{p_n} \subseteq ((A)_{p_n})_{p_n} = (A)_{2p_n} \text{ for } n \in I.$$

But $\lim(p_n: n \in I) = 0$, so $[y_0, z_0] \subseteq \bigcap \{(A)_{2p_n}: n \in I\} = A$. Thus A is m -convex. A similar argument reveals that $x \in A$, so $A \in \mathcal{C}_x$.

Therefore every infinite subset of \mathcal{C}_x converges to a member of \mathcal{C}_x , and \mathcal{C}_x is compact. Hence $\{\mathcal{C}_x: x \in T\}$ is a collection of compact sets having the finite intersection property, and $\bigcap \{\mathcal{C}_x: x \in T\} \neq \emptyset$. For A in this intersection, A is an m -convex subset of S which contains T , finishing the proof of the theorem.

REMARK. It is interesting to notice that Theorem 1 is valid when R^d is replaced by an arbitrary Banach space.

3. **The 3-convex case.** The following theorem gives sufficient conditions for a subset T_0 of S to lie in a 3-convex subset of S .

THEOREM 2. *Let S be a closed subset of R^d , $T_0 \subseteq S$, and let $T_1 = \{P: P \text{ a polytope in } S \text{ having vertex set in } T_0, \dim P \leq d - 1\}$. If for every three members of T_1 , at least one of the corresponding convex hulls $\text{conv}\{P_i \cup P_j\}$, $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, lies in S , then T_0 lies in a 3-convex subset of S .*

PROOF. Define U to be the union of T_1 together with all the simply connected regions bounded by $(d - 1)$ -polytopes contained in members of T_1 . Let $T = \text{cl } U$. We assert that T is the required 3-convex subset of S .

To see that $U \subseteq S$, note that for every point x in U , either x is in T_1 (and hence in S) or x is interior to some region R which is bounded by a subset of $\bigcup T_1$. In the latter case, R has as its boundary a union of $(d - 1)$ -polytopes, each contained in a member of T_1 , and an easy inductive argument shows that $R \subseteq S$. Then $U \subseteq S$, and since S is closed, $T = \text{cl } U \subseteq S$.

Thus it remains to show only that T is 3-convex. Now if T is not connected, then clearly our hypothesis will imply that T consists of two components, each convex, and T will indeed be 3-convex. Hence we assume that T is connected and nonconvex.

Since T is closed, connected, and nonconvex, T cannot be locally convex [4], so T contains at least one point of local nonconvexity. We assert that for q an lnc point of T , $q \in \ker T$: For any neighborhood N of q , there are points t_1, t_2 in U with $[t_1, t_2] \not\subseteq T$. Now t_1, t_2 are in simply connected subsets of S bounded by polytopes which are contained in members of T_1 , so $[t_1, t_2]$ intersects polytopes P_1, P_2 of T_1 for which $\text{conv}\{P_1 \cup P_2\} \not\subseteq S$. Since such a pair P_{1n}, P_{2n} may be selected for every neighborhood $N(q, 1/n)$ of q having radius $1/n$, in this manner we select sequences $\{P_{1n}\}, \{P_{2n}\}$ such that each P_{in} is a member of T_1 nondisjoint from $N(q, 1/n)$, and so that

$$\text{conv}\{P_{1n} \cup P_{2n}\} \not\subseteq S \quad \text{for each } n.$$

For z in T , $z \neq q$, there is a sequence $\{u_n\}$ in U converging to z , and the ray $R(q, u_n)$ emanating from q through u_n intersects some member P_{3n} of T_1 at a point u'_n , where $q < u_n \leq u'_n$. Then by hypothesis, for at least one of $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, $\text{conv}\{P_{1n} \cup P_{3n}\} \subseteq S$. Hence for one of $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, say for

$i = 1$, $\text{conv}\{P_{1n} \cup P_{3n}\} \subseteq S$ for all n in some infinite index set I . And so $\text{conv}\{P_{1n} \cup P_{3n}\} \subseteq T$ for these n . Since every neighborhood of q contains points in all but a finite number of the P_{1n} sets, this implies that

$$[q, u_n] \subseteq \text{conv}\{q \cup P_{3n}\} \subseteq \text{cl conv}\{P_{1n} \cup P_{3n}\} \subseteq \text{cl } T = T$$

whenever $n \in I$. Thus for $n \in I$, $[q, u_n] \subseteq T$, and $[q, z] \subseteq T$. Hence $q \in \ker T$ and our assertion is proved.

Finally, to complete the proof that T is 3-convex, let x_1, x_2, x_3 be in T and again let q be an lnc point of T . Now if any x_i is q , the argument is trivial, so assume that $x_i \neq q$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. There are sequences $\{y_{1n}\}, \{y_{2n}\}, \{y_{3n}\}$ in $U \sim \{q\}$ converging to x_1, x_2, x_3 , respectively, and the ray $R(q, y_{in})$ cuts some member P_{in} of T_1 at y'_{in} , $q < y_{in} \leq y'_{in}$. For each n , there correspond an appropriate i and j , $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, for which $\text{conv}\{P_{in} \cup P_{jn}\} \subseteq U$. Hence for some infinite subset I of natural numbers and for at least one pair i, j in $\{1, 2, 3\}$, say for $i = 1$ and $j = 2$, $\text{conv}\{P_{1n} \cup P_{2n}\} \subseteq U$ whenever $n \in I$. Since $q \in \ker T$, it follows that $\text{conv}\{q \cup P_{1n} \cup P_{2n}\} \subseteq T$ for all $n \in I$. Then $\text{conv}\{q, y_{1n}, y_{2n}\} \subseteq T$ for $n \in I$, and $\text{conv}\{q, x_1, x_2\} \subseteq T$. Hence $[x_1, x_2] \subseteq T$ and T is indeed a 3-convex subset of S , finishing the proof of Theorem 2.

The following corollary is a direct application of Theorem 2 to the planar case.


COROLLARY. *Let S be a closed subset of the plane, $T_0 \subseteq S$, and let $T_1 = \{[x, y]: x, y \text{ in } T_0 \text{ and } [x, y] \subseteq S\}$. Assume that for every three segments s_1, s_2, s_3 (possibly degenerate) in T_1 , at least one of the corresponding convex hulls $\text{conv}\{s_i \cup s_j\}$, $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, lies in S . Then T_0 lies in a 3-convex subset of S .*

Note that the condition stated in Theorem 2 and its corollary is sufficient but not necessary for T_0 to lie in a 3-convex subset of S , as Example 1 illustrates.

EXAMPLE 1. Let S be the boundary of a nondegenerate triangle A in the plane, T_0 the vertex set of A . Then clearly T_1 is the set of edges of A and cannot satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 2, yet T_0 lies in a union of two convex subsets of S . (Consider a vertex and its opposite edge.)

Also, it is interesting to notice that the dimension of the sets in T_1 above cannot be reduced. In the planar case, for every three points of T_0 , one of the corresponding segments may lie in S without T_0 being contained in a 3-convex subset of S . In fact we have a more surprising result: Even if every three points of $\cup T_1$ have a corresponding segment in S , the result of Theorem 2 fails; as the following example reveals.

EXAMPLE 2. Let S be the set in Figure 1, $T_0 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, and let $T_1 = \{[x, y]: x, y \in T_0 \text{ and } [x, y] \subseteq S\}$. Then for every three points in $\cup T_1$, one of the corresponding segments is in S , yet T_0 does not lie in a 3-convex subset of S . (Otherwise, since $p \in \ker S \cap \text{bdry } S$ and q is not an lnc point, by [1, Theorem 1, Corollary 2], T_0 could be partitioned into sets A, B so that $\text{conv } A \cup \text{conv } B \subseteq S$, clearly impossible.)



In conclusion, the proof of Theorem 2 may be adapted appropriately to yield the following result for m -convex sets.

THEOREM 3. *Let S be a closed subset of R^d with $\ker S \neq \emptyset$. Let $T_0 \subseteq S$ and let $T_1 = \{P: P \text{ a polytope in } S \text{ having vertex set in } T_0, \dim P \leq d - 1\}$. If for every m members of T_1 , at least one of the corresponding convex hulls*

$$\text{conv}\{P_i \cup P_j\}, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq m,$$

lies in S , then T_0 lies in an m -convex subset of S .

PROOF. Define T as in the proof of Theorem 2 and let $T' = \cup \{[p, t]: t \in T\}$, where $p \in \ker S$. Using techniques similar to those in Theorem 2, it is easy to show that T' is the required m -convex subset of S .

REFERENCES

1. Marilyn Breen and David C. Kay, *General decomposition theorems for m -convex sets in the plane*, Israel J. Math. (to appear).
2. J. F. Lawrence, W. R. Hare, Jr. and John W. Kenelly, *Finite unions of convex sets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **34** (1972), 225–228. MR **45** #1040.
3. W. L. Stamey and J. M. Marr, *Unions of two convex sets*, Canad. J. Math. **15** (1963), 152–156. MR **26** #2946.
4. F. A. Valentine, *Convex sets*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964. MR **30** #503.
5. ———, *A three point convexity property*, Pacific J. Math. **7** (1957), 1227–1235. MR **20** #6071.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, NORMAN, OKLAHOMA 73069