

## SELECTIONS AND HIGHER SEPARATION AXIOMS

VALENTIN GUTEV

ABSTRACT. This survey presents some historical background and recent developments in the area of selections for set-valued mappings along with several open questions. It was written with the hope that the presented material may pique an interest in the selection problem for set-valued mappings — a problem with a fascinating history and appealing applications.

1. The Selection Problem. . . . .	2
2. Selections and Dowker’s Extension Theorem . . . . .	2
2.1. Collectionwise Normality (3) $\diamond$ 2.2. Selections and Extensions (3) $\diamond$ 2.3. PF-Normality (4) $\diamond$ 2.4. Selections and Collectionwise Normality (5) $\diamond$ 2.5. Selection Compact-Deficiency (5) $\diamond$ 2.6. Approximate Selections (7).	
3. Selections and Continuity-Like Properties . . . . .	11
3.1. Selection Factorisation Properties (11) $\diamond$ 3.2. Continuity of Set-Valued Mappings (12) $\diamond$ 3.3. Hybrid Continuity and Selections (14) $\diamond$ 3.4. Densely Compact-Valued Mappings (16) $\diamond$ 3.5. Extending Selections (16).	
4. Selections and Compact-Like Families. . . . .	17
4.1. A General Selection Problem (17) $\diamond$ 4.2. A Necessary Condition (18) $\diamond$ 4.3. Selections and Reflexive Banach Spaces (19) $\diamond$ 4.4. Norm-Minimal Selections (20) $\diamond$ 4.5. Selections and Hilbert Spaces (21) $\diamond$ 4.6. Selections and $\ell_p(\mathcal{A})$ -spaces (23).	
5. Selections and Finite-Dimensional Spaces. . . . .	24
5.1. Selection Extension and Approximation Properties (24) $\diamond$ 5.2. Hybrid Selection Theorems (25) $\diamond$ 5.3. Selection Homotopy Extension Properties (27) $\diamond$ 5.4. Selections and Weak Deformation Retracts (28).	

---

*Date:* March 23, 2021.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 54C60, 54C65; Secondary 46A25, 46B10, 46C05, 54C20, 54C55, 54D15, 54F35, 54F45, 55P05.

*Key words and phrases.* Set-valued mapping, lower semi-continuous, continuous selection, continuous extension, reflexive Banach space, finite-dimensional space, infinite-dimensional space.

6. Selections and Infinite-Dimensional Spaces. . . . .	29
6.1. Selections and Countable Dimensionality (29) $\diamond$ 6.2. Selections and $C$ -spaces (30) $\diamond$ 6.3. Selections Avoiding Sets (33) $\diamond$ 6.4. Selections and Convex $G_\delta$ -Sets (33) $\diamond$ 6.5. Disjoint Sections and Selections (36).	

## 1. The Selection Problem

In the mid 1950's Ernest Michael wrote a series of fundamental papers [54, 55, 56] relating familiar extension theorems to selections, thus laying down the foundation of the theory of continuous selections. Nowadays, selections became an indispensable tool for many mathematicians working in vastly different areas. However, the key importance of Michael's selection theory is not only in providing a comprehensive solution to diverse selection problems, but also in the immediate inclusion of the obtained results into the general context of development of topology. In the first of these papers [54], Michael wrote:

“One of the most interesting and important problems in topology is the *extension problem*: Two topological spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  are given, together with a closed  $A \subset X$ , and we would like to know whether every continuous function  $g : A \rightarrow Y$  can be extended to a continuous function  $f$  from  $X$  (or at least from some open  $U \supset A$ ) into  $Y$ . Sometimes there are additional requirements on  $f$ , which frequently (as in the theory of fibre bundles) take the following form: For every  $x$  in  $X$ ,  $f(x)$  must be an element of a pre-assigned subset of  $Y$ . This new problem, which we call the *selection problem*, is clearly more general than the extension problem, and presents a challenge even when  $A$  is the null set or a 1-point set (where the extension problem is trivial).”

Michael proceeded to remark that with the exception of sandwich-like theorems, such as Tong [91, 92], Katětov [50, 51] and Dowker [16], no attempt has been made to obtain results under minimal hypotheses. Then he stated the purpose of his papers emphasising that most of the familiar extension theorems, such as the Tietze-Urysohn extension theorem, Kuratowski's extension theorem for finite-dimensional spaces and the Borsuk homotopy extension theorem can be slightly altered and essentially generalised in terms of selection theorems.

The present survey contains different aspects of Michael's selection theory, possible new research directions along with several open questions.

## 2. Selections and Dowker's Extension Theorem

In this section, and the rest of the paper, all spaces are Hausdorff topological spaces. However, several of the considerations are also valid for  $T_1$ -spaces, and some even without assuming any separation axioms.

**2.1. Collectionwise Normality.** A space  $X$  is *collectionwise normal* (Bing [7]) if for every discrete collection  $\mathcal{D}$  of subsets of  $X$  there exists a discrete collection  $\{U_D : D \in \mathcal{D}\}$  of open subsets of  $X$  such that  $D \subset U_D$ , for all  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ . In this case, we simply say that  $\mathcal{D}$  has an *open discrete expansion*. Every collectionwise normal space is normal, but the converse is not necessarily true. In the same paper, see [7, Examples G and H], Bing described an example of a normal space which is not collectionwise normal, now known as Bing’s example [24, 5.1.23 Bing’s Example]. He also proved that full normality (i.e. paracompactness) implies collectionwise normality but not conversely [7, Theorem 12]. Recall that a space  $X$  is *paracompact* if every open cover of  $X$  has a locally finite open refinement.

Since the closure of the elements of any discrete collection is a discrete collection too, a space  $X$  is collectionwise normal if every discrete collection  $\mathcal{D}$  of closed subsets of  $X$  has an open discrete expansion. In the presence of normality, this can be further relaxed to requiring  $\mathcal{D}$  to have only an *open pairwise-disjoint expansion* (i.e. an open pairwise-disjoint family  $\{U_D : D \in \mathcal{D}\}$  with  $D \subset U_D$ , for all  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ ).

Collectionwise normality is a natural generalisation of normality. Indeed, if  $X$  has this property with respect to discrete families  $\mathcal{D}$  of cardinality at most  $\tau$ , then it is called  $\tau$ -*collectionwise normal*. Thus,  $X$  is normal iff it is 2-collectionwise normal (or, more generally,  $n$ -collectionwise normal for every finite  $n \geq 2$ ). In fact, a space  $X$  is normal iff it is  $\omega$ -collectionwise normal, which follows easily from Urysohn’s characterisation of normality. On the other hand, for every infinite cardinal  $\tau$  there exists a  $\tau$ -collectionwise normal space which is not  $\tau^+$ -collectionwise normal [74], where the cardinal  $\tau^+$  is the immediate successor of  $\tau$ .

Collectionwise normality is the natural domain for continuous extensions. The following extension theorem was proved by Dowker [17], and is commonly called *Dowker’s extension theorem*.

**Theorem 2.1** ([17]). *A space  $X$  is collectionwise normal if and only if for every closed subset  $A \subset X$ , every continuous map from  $A$  to a Banach space  $E$  can be continuously extended to the whole of  $X$ .*

For a simple proof of Theorem 2.1, the interested reader is referred to [38].

**2.2. Selections and Extensions.** For a space  $Y$ , let  $\mathcal{F}(Y)$  be the collection of all nonempty closed subsets of  $Y$ ;  $\mathcal{C}(Y)$  — that of all compact members of  $\mathcal{F}(Y)$ ; and  $\mathcal{C}'(Y) = \mathcal{C}(Y) \cup \{Y\}$ . For a (not necessarily convex) subset  $Y$  of a normed space  $E$ , we will use the subscript “c” to denote the convex members of anyone of the above families; namely,  $\mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  for the convex members of  $\mathcal{F}(Y)$ ;  $\mathcal{C}_c(Y)$  for those of  $\mathcal{C}(Y)$ ; and  $\mathcal{C}'_c(Y) = \mathcal{C}_c(Y) \cup \{Y\}$ .

For spaces (sets)  $X$  and  $Y$ , we write  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  to designate that  $\Phi$  is a *set-valued* (or *multi-valued*) *mapping* from  $X$  to the nonempty subsets of  $Y$ . Such a

mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is *lower semi-continuous*, or *l.s.c.*, if the set

$$\Phi^{-1}[U] = \{x \in X : \Phi(x) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$$

is open in  $X$ , for every open  $U \subset Y$ . Finally, let us recall that a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a *selection* (or a *single-valued selection*) for  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  if  $f(x) \in \Phi(x)$ , for every  $x \in X$ . The following natural relationship between selections and extensions is well known.

**Proposition 2.2.** *For a subset  $A \subset X$  and  $g : A \rightarrow Y$ , define a set-valued mapping  $\Phi_g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'(Y)$  by  $\Phi_g(x) = \{g(x)\}$  if  $x \in A$ , and  $\Phi_g(x) = Y$  otherwise. Then*

- (i)  *$f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous selection for  $\Phi_g$  if and only if it is a continuous extension for  $g$ .*
- (ii) *If  $Y$  has at least two points, then  $\Phi_g$  is l.s.c. if and only if  $A$  is closed and  $g$  is continuous.*

Proposition 2.2(i) is [54, Example 1.3], and follows immediately from the definition of  $\Phi_g$ . The one direction of Proposition 2.2(ii) is [54, Example 1.3\*]; the other follows from the fact that  $Y$  contains nonempty disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $V$ , hence  $X \setminus A = \Phi_g^{-1}[U] \cap \Phi_g^{-1}[V]$ .

According to Proposition 2.2, any extension theorem can be restated as a selection theorem for the mapping  $\Phi_g$ . Based on this, Michael [54, 55, 56] proposed several selection theorems generalising ordinary extension theorems. Here are two of them whose prototype is Dowker's extension theorem (Theorem 2.1).

**Theorem 2.3** ([54]). *A space  $X$  is collectionwise normal if and only if for every Banach space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

**Theorem 2.4** ([54]). *A space  $X$  is paracompact if and only if for every Banach space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

However, the proof of Theorem 2.3 in [54] was incomplete and, in fact, working only for the case of  $\mathcal{C}_c(E)$ -valued mappings. The first complete proof of this theorem was given by Choban and Valov [15] using a different technique. A simple proof of Theorem 2.3, based on Theorem 2.1, was given in [39].

**2.3. PF-Normality.** For an infinite cardinal number  $\tau$ , a space  $X$  is called  $\tau$ -*PF-normal* (see [89]) if every point-finite open cover of  $X$  of cardinality  $\leq \tau$  is normal. Every  $\tau$ -collectionwise normal space is  $\tau$ -PF-normal (see [53]), and  $\omega$ -PF-normality coincides with normality [63]. However, PF-normality is neither identical to collectionwise normality (see Bing's example [7] and [53, Example 1]), nor to normality ([53, Example 2]). For some properties of PF-normal spaces, the interested reader is referred to [41, Section 3] and [53].

In the realm of normal spaces, PF-normal spaces coincide with the *point-finitely paracompact spaces* in the sense of Kandô [47]; while, in Nedev's terminology [69],  $\tau$ -PF-normal spaces are precisely the  $\tau$ -*pointwise- $\aleph_0$ -paracompact spaces*. The following characterisation of PF-normal spaces was obtained by Kandô [47] and Nedev [69].

**Theorem 2.5** ([47, 69]). *A space  $X$  is PF-normal if and only if for every normed space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

**2.4. Selections and Collectionwise Normality.** For a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we will use  $\mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(p)$  for the open  $\varepsilon$ -ball centred at a point  $p \in Y$ ; and  $\mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(S) = \bigcup_{p \in S} \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(p)$ , whenever  $S \subset Y$ . A map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -*selection* for a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  if  $f(x) \in \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(\Phi(x))$ , for every  $x \in X$ .

Although Theorem 2.3 is valid in the way it was stated by Michael, it was shown in [39, Theorem 1.2] that it is equivalent to both Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.5. In fact, a bit more was obtained in [39], see [39, Claim 2.1].

**Theorem 2.6** ([39]). *Let  $E$  be a Banach space. Then for a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *Every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*
- (b) *If  $A \subset X$  is closed, then every l.s.c. mapping  $\varphi : A \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection, and every continuous  $g : A \rightarrow E$  can be extended to a continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow E$ .*
- (c) *If  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is an l.s.c. convex-valued mapping which admits a continuous map  $g : X \rightarrow E$  such that  $\Phi(x)$  is compact whenever  $g(x) \notin \Phi(x)$ , then  $\Phi$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

It should be remarked that the proof of Theorem 2.6 is straightforward avoiding any explicit reference to collectionwise normality. It should be also remarked that the equivalence (a)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (b) in Theorem 2.6 represents the selection property of PF-normality (Theorem 2.5) which, together with Dowker's extension theorem (Theorem 2.1), gives Theorem 2.3. This brings the natural question of whether there is any selection generalisation of Dowker's extension theorem. Various aspects of this question are discussed below.

**2.5. Selection Compact-Deficiency.** Motivated by (c) of Theorem 2.6, the following question was posed in [39, Question 1].

**Question 1** ([39]). *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space and  $E$  be a Banach space. Suppose that  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  is an l.s.c. mapping which admits a continuous map  $g : X \rightarrow E$  with  $\Phi(x)$  compact, whenever  $g(x) \notin \Phi(x)$  for some  $x \in X$ . Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?*

If  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'(E)$  and  $g : X \rightarrow E$  is any map, then  $\Phi(x)$  is compact for every  $x \in X$  with  $g(x) \notin \Phi(x)$ . Moreover, for a collectionwise normal space  $X$

and a Banach space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'(E)$  has a continuous selection, by Theorem 2.3. Thus, the answer to Question 1 is “Yes” for  $\mathcal{C}'(E)$ -valued mappings. A natural example of mappings which are as in Question 1, but not  $\mathcal{C}'(E)$ -valued, is given at the end of this section, see Remark 2.20.

If  $\mathbf{0} \in E$  is the origin of a normed space  $E$  and  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'(E)$ , then  $\varphi(x)$  is compact for every  $x \in X$  with  $\mathbf{0} \notin \varphi(x)$ . This property is equivalent to the one in Question 1. Indeed, let  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  and  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be a continuous map with  $\Phi(x)$  compact, whenever  $g(x) \notin \Phi(x)$  for some  $x \in X$ . Define a mapping  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  by  $\varphi(x) = \Phi(x) - g(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ . Then  $\varphi(x)$  is compact for every  $x \in X$  with  $\mathbf{0} \notin \varphi(x)$ , and  $\varphi$  has a continuous selection if and only if so does  $\Phi$ . Thus, we have the following relaxed form of Question 1.

**Question 2.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\varphi(x)$  is compact, for every  $x \in X$  with  $\mathbf{0} \notin \varphi(x)$ . Does  $\varphi$  have a continuous selection?

Here are some further remarks regarding some of the challenges in this question.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $E$  be a metrizable space,  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  be l.s.c. and  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be continuous. Then  $\{x \in X : g(x) \in \varphi(x)\}$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set in  $X$ .*

Complementary to Proposition 2.7 is the following observation.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a normed space and  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\varphi(x)$  is compact, for every  $x \in X$  with  $\mathbf{0} \notin \varphi(x)$ . Set  $H = \{x \in X : \mathbf{0} \notin \varphi(x)\}$ . Then  $\varphi \upharpoonright H$  has a continuous selection. If, moreover,  $E$  is a Banach space, then  $\varphi \upharpoonright G$  has a continuous selection for some  $G_\delta$ -subset  $G \subset X$  with  $H \subset G$ .*

*Proof.* According to [80, Theorem 1.3] and Proposition 2.7,  $H$  is itself a collectionwise normal space. Hence, by Theorem 2.3 (see also Theorem 2.5),  $\varphi \upharpoonright H$  has a continuous selection  $h : H \rightarrow E$ . If  $E$  is a Banach space, then  $h$  can be extended to a continuous map  $g : Z \rightarrow E$  for some  $G_\delta$ -subset  $Z \subset X$  containing  $H$ , see [24, Theorem 4.3.20]. Applying Proposition 2.7 once more, the set  $G = \{x \in Z : g(x) \in \varphi(x)\}$  is also  $G_\delta$ , and clearly contains  $H$ .  $\square$

Propositions 2.7 and 2.8 show that the mapping  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  in Question 2 has two partial continuous selections on complementary subsets of the domain. Hence, a particular challenge in this question (and in Question 1 as well) is if one can use these partial selections to construct a continuous selection for the mapping  $\varphi$  itself. This brings the following alternative question.

**Question 3.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping and  $H = \{x \in X : \mathbf{0} \notin \varphi(x)\}$ . Does there exist a continuous selection for  $\varphi$  provided  $\varphi \upharpoonright H$  has a continuous selection?

The property in Question 3 implies collectionwise normality of  $X$ . Indeed, take a closed set  $A \subset X$  and a continuous map  $g : A \rightarrow E$  into a Banach space  $E$ . Next, let  $\Phi_g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  be the associated mapping defined as in Proposition 2.2. Then  $\Phi_g$  is l.s.c. and  $H = \{x \in X : \mathbf{0} \notin \Phi_g(x)\} \subset A$ . Hence,  $g \upharpoonright H$  is a continuous selection for  $\Phi_g \upharpoonright H$ . Thus, by Proposition 2.2, the existence of a continuous selection for  $\Phi_g$  (as per Question 3) is equivalent to the existence of a continuous extension of  $g$ , i.e. to collectionwise normality of  $X$  (by Theorem 2.1). This suggests the following interpretation of Question 3 in the setting of PF-normal spaces.

**Question 4.** Let  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping, where  $X$  is a PF-normal space and  $E$  is a Banach space. Suppose that there exists a continuous map  $h : X \rightarrow E$  such that  $h(x) \in \varphi(x)$ , for every  $x \in X$  with  $\mathbf{0} \notin \varphi(x)$ . Does  $\varphi$  have a continuous selection?

**2.6. Approximate Selections.** In what follows, to each  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  we will associate the mapping  $\overline{\Phi} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  defined by  $\overline{\Phi}(x) = \overline{\Phi(x)}$ ,  $x \in X$ . Moreover, for a pair of mappings  $\Phi, \Psi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  with  $\Phi(x) \cap \Psi(x) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $x \in X$ , we will use  $\Phi \wedge \Psi$  to denote their intersection, i.e. the mapping which assigns to each  $x \in X$  the set  $[\Phi \wedge \Psi](x) = \Phi(x) \cap \Psi(x)$ . The *graph* of a mapping  $\Psi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is the set  $\{(x, y) \in X \times Y : y \in \Psi(x)\}$ , and we say that  $\Psi$  has an *open* (*closed*) graph if its graph is open (respectively, closed) in  $X \times Y$ . Finally, to each  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  into a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$ , we will associate the mapping  $\mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[\Phi] : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  defined by  $\mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[\Phi](x) = \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(\Phi(x))$ ,  $x \in X$ . This convention will be also used in an obvious manner for usual maps  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  considering  $f$  as the singleton-valued mapping  $x \rightarrow \{f(x)\}$ ,  $x \in X$ . In these terms, for  $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $\varepsilon, \mu > 0$ , we have that  $f$  is a  $\mu$ -selection for  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  with  $\rho(f(x), g(x)) < \varepsilon$  for every  $x \in X$ , if and only if  $f$  is a selection for the mapping  $\mathbf{O}_\mu[\Phi] \wedge \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[g]$ .

The following three observations are due to Michael, see [54, Propositions 2.3 and 2.5] and [55, Lemma 11.3]. For a paracompact domain, they reduce the selection problem for l.s.c. mappings to that one of approximate selections (see Proposition 2.12).

**Proposition 2.9** ([54]). *For spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is l.s.c. if and only if so is the mapping  $\overline{\Phi} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$ .*

**Proposition 2.10** ([54]). *Let  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  be an l.s.c. mapping and  $\Psi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  be an open-graph mapping with  $\Phi(x) \cap \Psi(x) \neq \emptyset$ , for all  $x \in X$ . Then the mapping  $\Phi \wedge \Psi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is also l.s.c.*

**Proposition 2.11** ([55]). *If  $(Y, \rho)$  is a metric space,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is l.s.c., then the associated mapping  $\mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[\Phi] : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  has an open graph. In particular, for each compact set  $K \subset Y$ , the set  $\{x \in X : K \subset \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[\Phi](x)\}$  is open in  $X$ .*

We now have the following general observation which is a partial case of [55, Proof that Lemma 5.1 implies Theorem 4.1, page 569].

**Proposition 2.12** ([55]). *Let  $E$  be a Banach space. Then for a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *Each l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*
- (b) *Each l.s.c. convex-valued mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is an l.s.c. convex-valued mapping, then by Proposition 2.9, so is  $\overline{\Phi} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$ . Moreover, if  $f : X \rightarrow E$  is a selection for  $\overline{\Phi}$ , then  $f$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -selection for  $\Phi$ , for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . This shows that (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). To see that (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a), suppose that (b) holds, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  is l.s.c. Then by (b),  $\Phi$  has a continuous  $2^{-1}$ -selection  $f_1 : X \rightarrow E$ . According to Propositions 2.10 and 2.11,  $\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_{2^{-1}}[f_1] : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is also l.s.c., and clearly it is convex-valued. Hence, for the same reason, it has a continuous  $2^{-2}$ -selection  $f_2 : X \rightarrow E$ . Evidently,  $f_2$  is a continuous  $2^{-2}$ -selection for  $\Phi$  with  $\|f_2(x) - f_1(x)\| < 2^{-2} + 2^{-1} < 2^0$ ,  $x \in X$ . The construction can be carried on by induction to get a sequence  $f_n : X \rightarrow E$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , of continuous  $2^{-n}$ -selections for  $\Phi$  such that  $\|f_{n+1}(x) - f_n(x)\| < 2^{-n+1}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . This resulting sequence of maps is uniformly Cauchy, hence it converges to some continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow E$  because  $E$  is a Banach space; and this  $f$  is a continuous selection for  $\Phi$  as required in (a).  $\square$

Complementary to Proposition 2.12 is the following consequence of Theorems 2.3 and 2.6.

**Corollary 2.13.** *Let  $E$  be a Banach space,  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space and  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  be an l.s.c. convex-valued mapping such that  $\Phi(x)$  is compact, for every  $x \in X$  with  $\mathbf{0} \notin \Phi(x)$ . Then  $\Phi$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

This brings the following alternative question, which represents another aspect of Question 2 (hence, of Question 1 as well).

**Question 5.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping which has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

Evidently, the answer is “Yes” if  $\Phi$  is a  $\mathcal{C}'_c(E)$ -valued mapping. Moreover, the property in Question 5 implies collectionwise normality.

**Proposition 2.14.** *Let  $X$  be a space such that for every Banach space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $X$  is collectionwise normal.*

*Proof.* Let  $A \subset X$  be closed,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $g : A \rightarrow E$  be a continuous map. Then the mapping  $\Phi_g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$ , defined as in Proposition 2.2, is l.s.c.



Hence, by condition,  $\Phi_g$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . In other words, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the mapping  $\Phi(x) = E$ ,  $x \in X$ , has a continuous selection  $h : X \rightarrow E$  such that  $\|h(x) - g(x)\| < \varepsilon$ , for all  $x \in A$ . According to [42, Lemma 4.2],  $g$  can be extended to a continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow E$ . Hence, by Theorem 2.1,  $X$  is collectionwise normal.  $\square$

If  $X$  is only assumed to be PF-normal, then the answer to Question 5 is “Yes” if each  $\Phi(x)$  is either compact or finite-dimensional. The latter means that  $\Phi(x)$  is contained in some finite-dimensional affine subspace of  $E$ ; equivalently, that  $\Phi(x) \subset q + L$  for some  $q \in E$  and a finite-dimensional linear subspace  $L \subset E$ .

**Proposition 2.15.** *Let  $X$  be a PF-normal space,  $E$  be a normed space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that each  $\Phi(x)$  is either compact or finite-dimensional. If  $\Phi$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then it also has a continuous selection.*

*Proof.* Let  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection for  $\Phi$ , for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then by Propositions 2.10 and 2.11, the intersection mapping  $\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[g] : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is also l.s.c. Hence, by Proposition 2.9, so is the mapping  $\varphi = \overline{\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[g]} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$ . Furthermore,  $\varphi$  is compact-valued. Indeed, if  $\Phi(x)$  is compact, then so is  $\varphi(x)$ . If  $\Phi(x)$  is finite-dimensional, then  $\Phi(x) \subset q + L$  for some finite-dimensional linear subspace  $L \subset E$  and  $q \in E$ . However,  $L$  is complete with respect to the norm of  $E$  (being finite-dimensional) and  $\varphi(x) - q \subset L$  is closed and bounded in  $L$ . Therefore,  $\varphi(x)$  is compact being a translate of the compact set  $\varphi(x) - q$ . Thus, by Theorem 2.5,  $\varphi$  has a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$ . This  $f$  is also a selection for  $\Phi$  because  $\varphi(x) \subset \Phi(x)$ , for every  $x \in X$ .  $\square$

For an infinite cardinal number  $\tau$ , a space  $X$  is called  $\tau$ -paracompact if every open cover of  $X$  of cardinality  $\leq \tau$  has a locally finite open refinement. The  $\omega$ -paracompact spaces are commonly called *countably paracompact*. A mapping  $\varphi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is a *set-valued selection* (or *set-selection*, or *multi-selection*) for a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  if  $\varphi(x) \subset \Phi(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ . A mapping  $\varphi : X \rightsquigarrow E$ , into a metric space  $(E, d)$ , is *bounded* if each  $\varphi(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , is a bounded subset of  $(E, d)$ . In these terms, the property in Proposition 2.15 that “ $\Phi$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ ” was used to construct a bounded-valued l.s.c. selection  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  for  $\Phi$ . Regarding this, let us mention the following property of countable paracompactness, see [83, Lemma 2.1] and [88, Lemma 1.2].

**Proposition 2.16.** *Let  $E$  be a normed space and  $X$  be a countably paracompact space. Then every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection if and only if every bounded l.s.c. mapping  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

This brings the following characterisation of countably paracompact PF-normal spaces, compare with Proposition 2.15.

**Theorem 2.17.** *A space  $X$  is countably paracompact and PF-normal if and only if for every normed space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  with  $\Phi(x)$  being either compact or finite-dimensional, has continuous selection.*

*Proof.* In the one direction, this is Theorem 2.5 and Proposition 2.16 because each closed bounded subset of a finite-dimensional normed space is compact, see the proof of Proposition 2.15. Conversely, if  $X$  has the selection property in the theorem, then it is PF-normal (by Theorem 2.5). By taking  $E$  to be the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  and using [54, Theorem 3.1''],  $X$  is also countably paracompact.  $\square$

A function  $\xi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *lower (upper) semi-continuous* if the set

$$\{x \in X : \xi(x) > r\} \quad (\text{respectively, } \{x \in X : \xi(x) < r\})$$

is open in  $X$ , for every  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $(E, d)$  is a metric space,  $\varphi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  and  $\eta : X \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ , then we shall say that  $g : X \rightarrow E$  is an  $\eta$ -*selection* for  $\varphi$  if  $g(x) \in \mathbf{O}_{\eta(x)}(\varphi(x))$ , for every  $x \in X$ . According to Dowker-Katětov's insertion theorem [16, 50], see also [24, 5.5.20(a)], a space  $X$  is normal and countably paracompact if and only if for every pair  $\xi, \eta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of functions such that  $\xi$  is upper semi-continuous,  $\eta$  is lower semi-continuous and  $\xi < \eta$ , there exists a continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\xi < f < \eta$ . The following selection interpretation of this insertion property was shown in [39, Theorem 4.3].

**Theorem 2.18** ([39]). *A space  $X$  is countably paracompact and collectionwise normal if and only if for every Banach space  $E$ , l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$ , lower semi-continuous function  $\eta : X \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  and continuous  $\eta$ -selection  $g : X \rightarrow E$  for  $\Phi$ , there exists a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$  for  $\Phi$  with  $\|f(x) - g(x)\| < \eta(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ .*

Without the assumption of countable paracompactness, the following similar characterisation holds, see [39, Proposition 4.2].

**Proposition 2.19** ([39]). *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  be l.s.c.,  $\eta : X \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  be continuous and  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be a continuous  $\eta$ -selection for  $\Phi$ . Then  $\Phi$  has a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$  with  $\|f(x) - g(x)\| \leq \eta(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ .*

Motivated by this, the following question was posed in [39, Question 3].

**Question 6** ([39]). *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping and  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be a continuous  $\eta$ -selection for  $\Phi$ , for some lower semi-continuous function  $\eta : X \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ . Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$  with  $\|f(x) - g(x)\| \leq \eta(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ ?*

**Remark 2.20.** Let us point out that the answer to Question 6 is “Yes” if so is the answer to Question 1. Indeed, let  $\Phi$ ,  $\eta$  and  $g$  be as in Question 6. Then the mapping  $\mathbf{O}_\eta[g] : X \rightsquigarrow E$ , defined by  $\mathbf{O}_\eta[g](x) = \mathbf{O}_{\eta(x)}(g(x))$ ,  $x \in X$ , has an

open graph [37, Proposition 2.1], see also Proposition 2.11. Hence, the mapping  $\varphi = \Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\eta[g]$  remains convex-valued and l.s.c., by Propositions 2.9 and 2.10. Moreover,  $g(x) \notin \varphi(x)$  implies that  $\Phi(x) \neq E$  and, therefore,  $\varphi(x)$  is compact being a closed subset of the compact set  $\Phi(x)$ . Evidently, if  $f : X \rightarrow E$  is a continuous selection for  $\varphi$ , then  $\|f(x) - g(x)\| \leq \eta(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ .  $\square$

The property stated in Question 6 can be considered as a selection interpretation of the classical Katětov-Tong insertion theorem [50, 51, 91, 92], see also [24, 1.7.15(b)], that a space  $X$  is normal if and only if for every pair  $\xi, \eta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of functions such that  $\xi$  is upper semi-continuous,  $\eta$  is lower semi-continuous and  $\xi \leq \eta$ , there exists a continuous function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\xi \leq f \leq \eta$ .

### 3. Selections and Continuity-Like Properties

**3.1. Selection Factorisation Properties.** Here, we briefly discuss two paracompact-like properties of set-valued mappings which offer a natural generalisation of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4. They are based on the following idea of *factorising* set-valued mappings. For a metrizable space  $Y$  and a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$ , we say that a triple  $(Z, h, \varphi)$  is an *l.s.c. weak-factorisation for  $\Phi$*  [13, 69] if  $Z$  is a metrizable space with weight  $w(Z) \leq w(Y)$ ,  $h : X \rightarrow Z$  is continuous and  $\varphi : Z \rightsquigarrow Y$  is l.s.c. such that  $\varphi \circ h : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is a set-valued selection for  $\Phi$ .

In what follows, using the convex hull operator  $A \rightarrow \text{conv}(A)$  of a linear space  $E$ , to each mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  we will associate the mapping  $\text{conv}[\Phi] : X \rightsquigarrow E$ , defined by  $\text{conv}[\Phi](x) = \text{conv}(\Phi(x))$ ,  $x \in X$ . It is well known that lower semi-continuity is preserved by passing to the mapping  $\text{conv}[\Phi]$ , [54, Proposition 2.6].

**Proposition 3.1** ([54]). *Let  $E$  be a normed space and  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Then the mapping  $\text{conv}[\Phi] : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is also l.s.c.*

We now have the following general reduction of the selection problem for set-valued mappings.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $X$  be a space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be a mapping which admits an l.s.c. weak-factorisation. Then  $\Phi$  has a continuous selection.*

*Proof.* Let  $(Z, h, \varphi)$  be an l.s.c. weak-factorisation for  $\Phi$ . By Propositions 2.9 and 3.1, the associated mapping  $\text{conv}[\varphi] : Z \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  remains l.s.c. Hence, by Theorem 2.4, it has a continuous selection  $g : Z \rightarrow E$ . Then  $g \circ h : X \rightarrow E$  is a continuous selection for  $\Phi$  because  $\text{conv}[\varphi] \circ h : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  is a set-valued selection for  $\Phi$ .  $\square$

Considering l.s.c. weak-factorisations in the setting of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, Nedev [69] (see also [13]) defined the following property. A mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is said to have the *Selection Factorisation Property* (called *s.f.p.*, for short) if for

every closed subset  $F \subset X$  and every locally finite collection  $\mathcal{U}$  of open subsets of  $Y$  such that  $\Phi^{-1}[\mathcal{U}] = \{\Phi^{-1}[U] : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$  covers  $F$ , there exists a locally finite and open (in  $F$ ) cover of  $F$  which refines  $\Phi^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$ . The importance of s.f.p. mappings is evident from the following two observations.

**Example 3.3** ([69]). Let  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping, where  $Y$  is a metrizable space. Then  $\Phi$  has the s.f.p. provided  $X$  is  $w(Y)$ -paracompact, or when  $X$  is  $w(Y)$ -collectionwise normal and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'(Y)$ .

**Theorem 3.4** ([13, 69]). *Let  $X$  be a normal space and  $Y$  be a completely metrizable space. Then each s.f.p. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  has an l.s.c. weak-factorisation.*

To extend Theorem 3.4 to set-valued mappings defined on arbitrary spaces, the following similar property was defined in [35]. Let  $(Y, \rho)$  be a metric space. A mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is said to be *lower semi-factorisable relatively  $\rho$* , or  *$\rho$ -l.s.f.*, if for every closed subset  $F \subset X$ , every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and every (not necessarily continuous) selection  $s : F \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi \upharpoonright F$ , there exists a locally finite (in  $F$ ) covering  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $F$  of cozero-sets of  $F$ , and a map  $\kappa : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow F$  such that

$$|\mathcal{U}| \leq w(Y) \quad \text{and} \quad s(\kappa(U)) \in \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(\Phi(x)), \quad \text{for every } x \in U \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Here are two important properties of  $\rho$ -l.s.f. mappings.

**Example 3.5** ([35]). Let  $X$  be a normal space,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a metric space and  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  be an s.f.p. mapping. Then  $\Phi$  is  $\rho$ -l.s.f.

**Theorem 3.6** ([35]). *Let  $X$  be a space,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be a  $\rho$ -l.s.f. mapping. Then  $\Phi$  has an l.s.c. weak-factorisation.*

**3.2. Continuity of Set-Valued Mappings.** Based on Theorem 3.6, the  $\rho$ -l.s.f. mappings deal with several other selection theorems which are similar to Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, but any restriction on the domain is removed at the expense of strengthening the continuity of the set-valued mappings. This is discussed below.

A mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is called *continuous* if it is both l.s.c. and u.s.c. Here,  $\Phi$  is *u.s.c.*, or *upper semi-continuous*, if the set  $\Phi^{-1}[F]$  is closed in  $X$  for every closed  $F \subset Y$ ; equivalently, if  $\Phi^\# [U] = \{x \in X : \Phi(x) \subset U\}$  is open in  $X$ , for every open  $U \subset Y$ .

Let  $(Y, \rho)$  be a metric space. A mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is  *$\rho$ -l.s.c.* ( *$\rho$ -u.s.c.*) if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , each point  $p \in X$  has a neighbourhood  $V$  such that  $\Phi(p) \subset \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(\Phi(x))$  (respectively,  $\Phi(x) \subset \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(\Phi(p))$ ), for every  $x \in V$ . Metric semi-continuity offers other interpretations of continuity. Namely, a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is called

- (i)  *$\rho$ -continuous* if it is both  $\rho$ -l.s.c. and  $\rho$ -u.s.c.;
- (ii)  *$\rho$ -proximal continuous* if it is both l.s.c. and  $\rho$ -u.s.c.;

- (iii) *proximal continuous* if it is  $d$ -proximal continuous for some metric  $d$  on  $Y$ , which is topologically equivalent to  $\rho$ .

In the realm of set-valued mappings with a metrizable range, every continuous or  $\rho$ -continuous mapping is  $\rho$ -proximal continuous, but the converse is not true, see [35, Proposition 2.5]. Regarding continuity and  $\rho$ -continuity, it is well known that these properties coincide precisely when the range is a compact metric space, see e.g. [35, Proposition 2.6].

The continuous and  $\rho$ -continuous mappings fit naturally into the selection theory. Selection theorems for  $\rho$ -continuous mappings with paracompact (or even arbitrary) domain were obtained in [12, 56], while selection results for continuous mappings with arbitrary or (collectionwise) normal domain were obtained in [11, 25]. Subsequently, these results were extended to proximal continuous mappings based on the following example, see [35, Example 4.3].

**Example 3.7** ([35]). If  $X$  is a space and  $(Y, \rho)$  is a metric space, then each proximal continuous mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is  $\rho$ -l.s.f.

A subset  $A \subset X$  is  $P^\lambda$ -embedded in a space  $X$ , where  $\lambda$  is an infinite cardinal number, if for every locally finite cozero-set cover  $\mathscr{W}$  of  $A$  of cardinality  $|\mathscr{W}| \leq \lambda$ , there exists a locally finite cozero-set cover  $\mathscr{U}$  of  $X$  such that  $\mathscr{W}$  is refined by  $\mathscr{U} \upharpoonright A = \{U \cap A : U \in \mathscr{U}\}$ . The notion “ $P^\lambda$ -embedded” in this sense is the same as “ $P^\lambda$ -embedded” in the sense of Shapiro [82], which was introduced by Arens [4] under the name “ $\lambda$ -normally embedded” (see [82]). It is well known that every continuous map from a  $P^\lambda$ -embedded subset  $A$  of a space  $X$  into a Banach space  $E$  of weight  $w(E) \leq \lambda$ , is continuously extendable to the whole of  $X$  (Aló and Sennott [3], Morita [66], Przymusiński [75]). However, in the setting of arbitrary spaces, this extension property cannot be covered by the framework of continuous set-valued mapping. Indeed, for a Banach space  $E$ , a  $P^{w(E)}$ -embedded set  $A \subset X$  and a continuous map  $g : A \rightarrow E$ , the mapping  $\Phi_g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  defined as in Proposition 2.2 may fail to be even l.s.c.

To rectify this, the following approach was offered in [35]. A map  $g : A \rightarrow Y$ , where  $A \subset X$ , is called  $A$ -regular [35] if for every locally finite cozero-set cover  $\mathscr{V}$  of  $Y$ , there exists a locally finite cozero-set cover  $\mathscr{U}$  of  $X$  such that  $g(\mathscr{U})$  refines  $\mathscr{V}$ . A continuous  $g : A \rightarrow Y$  is  $A$ -regular, whenever  $A$  is  $P^{w(Y)}$ -embedded in  $X$ . Moreover, the restriction  $f \upharpoonright A$  is  $A$ -regular, for every continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  into a metrizable space  $Y$ . The following improved version of Example 3.7 was obtained in [35, Example 4.4].

**Example 3.8** ([35]). Let  $X$  be a space,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a metric space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be proximal continuous,  $A \subset X$  and  $g : A \rightarrow Y$  be an  $A$ -regular selection for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$ . Define  $\Phi_g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  by  $\Phi_g(x) = \{g(x)\}$  if  $x \in A$ , and  $\Phi_g(x) = \Phi(x)$  otherwise. Then the mapping  $\Phi_g$  is  $\rho$ -l.s.f.

Combining this example with Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 3.6, the following general result was obtained in [35, Corollary 6.2].

**Theorem 3.9** ([35]). *Let  $X$  be a space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be proximal continuous,  $A \subset X$  and  $g : A \rightarrow E$  be a continuous selection for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$ . Then  $g$  can be extended to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$  if and only if  $g$  can be extended to a continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow E$ .*

**3.3. Hybrid Continuity and Selections.** The following result was obtained in [41, Lemma 4.2].

**Theorem 3.10** ([41]). *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  be proximal continuous and  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. selection for  $\Phi$  such that  $\varphi(x)$  is compact, whenever  $\varphi(x) \neq \Phi(x)$ . Then  $\varphi$  has a continuous selection.*

Let us explicitly remark that the proof of Theorem 3.10 is based on the fact that, in this case, the mapping  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has the s.f.p. This idea is extended in the following similar result.

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be l.s.c. and  $A \subset X$  be a closed subset such that  $\Phi \upharpoonright X \setminus A$  is proximal continuous. Then each continuous selection  $g : A \rightarrow E$  for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$  can be extended to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $g : A \rightarrow E$  be a continuous selection for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$ . Define  $\Phi_g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  as in Example 3.8, namely  $\Phi_g(x) = \{g(x)\}$  if  $x \in A$  and  $\Phi_g(x) = \Phi(x)$  otherwise. The proof consists of showing that  $\Phi_g$  has the s.f.p. To this end, take a closed set  $F \subset X$ , and a locally finite family  $\mathcal{U}$  of open subsets of  $E$  with  $F \subset \bigcup \Phi_g^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$ . Since  $X$  is collectionwise normal, by Theorem 2.1,  $g$  can be extended to a continuous map  $h : X \rightarrow E$ . Then the family  $\mathcal{V}_0 = \{\Phi_g^{-1}[U] \cap h^{-1}(U) : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$  is open and locally finite in  $X$ , and refines  $\Phi_g^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$ . Moreover,  $F_0 = F \cap A \subset \bigcup \mathcal{V}_0$  because  $h \upharpoonright A = g$ . Set  $F_1 = F \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{V}_0$  and  $\varphi = \Phi_g \upharpoonright X \setminus A$ , so that  $F_1 \subset \bigcup \varphi^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$ . Since  $\varphi = \Phi \upharpoonright X \setminus A$  is proximal continuous, by [35, Theorem 3.1],  $\varphi^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$  is refined by a  $\sigma$ -discrete (in  $X \setminus A$ ) family  $\mathcal{W}$  of cozero-sets of  $X \setminus A$  such that  $\bigcup \mathcal{W} = \bigcup \varphi^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$ . Since  $X$  is normal, there exists an open set  $G \subset X$  with  $F_1 \subset G \subset \overline{G} \subset \bigcup \varphi^{-1}[\mathcal{U}] = \bigcup \mathcal{W}$ . Finally, using [64, Theorem 1.2] and [65, Theorem 1.2], take an open and locally finite (in  $X \setminus A$ ) cover  $\mathcal{W}_1$  of  $\overline{G}$ , which refines  $\mathcal{W}$ . Then the family  $\mathcal{V}_1 = \{W \cap G : W \in \mathcal{W}_1\}$  is open and locally finite in  $X$ . Moreover, it refines  $\Phi_g^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$  and covers  $F_1$  because

$$F_1 \subset G = \bigcup \mathcal{V}_1 \subset \bigcup \mathcal{W} = \bigcup \varphi^{-1}[\mathcal{U}] \subset \bigcup \Phi_g^{-1}[\mathcal{U}].$$

Accordingly,  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_0 \cup \mathcal{V}_1$  is a locally finite family of open subset of  $X$ , which refines  $\Phi_g^{-1}[\mathcal{U}]$  and covers  $F$ . Hence,  $\Phi_g$  has the s.f.p. and by Proposition 3.2 and

Theorem 3.4, it also has a continuous selection. Thus,  $g$  can be extended to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ .  $\square$

Theorems 3.10 and 3.11 are naturally related to  $\mathcal{C}'(E)$ -valued mappings. Turning to this, to each mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  we will associate the sets

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{C}_\Phi = \{x \in X : \Phi(x) \in \mathcal{C}(E)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{D}_\Phi = X \setminus \mathbf{C}_\Phi.$$

Here are some properties of these sets in the setting of  $\mathcal{C}'(E)$ -valued l.s.c. mappings.

**Proposition 3.12.** *Let  $E$  be a metrizable space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Then*

- (i)  $\Phi$  is continuous at each point  $x \in \mathbf{D}_\Phi$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{C}_\Phi$  is an  $F_\sigma$ -set;
- (iii) If  $\Phi[\mathbf{C}_\Phi] = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbf{C}_\Phi} \Phi(x)$  is not dense in  $E$ , then  $\mathbf{C}_\Phi$  is closed in  $X$ .

*Proof.* If  $p \in \mathbf{D}_\Phi$ , then  $\Phi^\#[\Phi(p)] = \Phi^\#[E] = X$  is open. This shows (i). If  $E$  is compact, then  $\mathbf{D}_\Phi = \emptyset$ . If not, take a countable locally finite open cover  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $E$ , which has no finite subcover. Then  $\mathbf{D}_\Phi = \bigcap \Phi^{-1}[\mathcal{V}]$ , which shows (ii). To show finally (iii), suppose that  $U \subset E$  is a nonempty open set with  $U \cap \Phi(x) = \emptyset$ , for every  $x \in \mathbf{C}_\Phi$ . Then  $\mathbf{D}_\Phi = \Phi^{-1}[U]$  is open, hence  $\mathbf{C}_\Phi$  is closed.  $\square$

Based on this proposition and Theorems 3.10 and 3.11, see also Question 1, we have the following question relating the set  $\mathbf{C}_\Phi$  to the selection problem for collectionwise normal spaces.

**Question 7.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping, which is continuous at each point  $p \in X$  with  $\Phi(p) \notin \mathcal{C}(E)$ . Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

Let  $X$  be a space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping and  $\mathbf{D}_\Phi$  be as in (3.1). If  $\Phi \upharpoonright \mathbf{D}_\Phi$  is continuous, then it has a continuous selection  $g : \mathbf{D}_\Phi \rightarrow E$  [35, Theorem 6.1], see also Theorem 3.9. Since  $E$  is a Banach space (hence, a complete metric space),  $g$  can be extended to a continuous map on some  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $X$  containing  $\mathbf{D}_\Phi$ , see [24, Theorem 4.3.21]. Thus, according to Proposition 2.7, we get the following consequence.

**Corollary 3.13.** *Let  $X$  be a space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\Phi \upharpoonright \mathbf{D}_\Phi$  is continuous. Then  $\Phi \upharpoonright H$  has a continuous selection for some  $G_\delta$ -subset  $H \subset X$  with  $\mathbf{D}_\Phi \subset H$ .*

On the other hand, collectionwise normality is hereditary with respect to  $F_\sigma$ -sets [80, Theorem 1.3]. So, complementary to Corollary 3.13 is the following consequence of Theorems 2.3 (see also Theorem 2.5) for the set  $\mathbf{C}_\Phi = X \setminus \mathbf{D}_\Phi$ .

**Corollary 3.14.** *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a normed space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Then  $\Phi \upharpoonright Z$  has a continuous selection, for every  $F_\sigma$ -set  $Z \subset X$  with  $Z \subset \mathbf{C}_\Phi$ .*

Corollaries 3.13 and 3.14 give a good illustration of Question 7 showing that one can construct two partial continuous selections for  $\Phi$  on complementary subsets of the domain. Hence, the question is if one can use these partial selections, or other information, to construct a continuous selection for the mapping  $\Phi$  itself. However, it is not so likely that any one of these partial selections can be extended to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ .

**Proposition 3.15.** *Let  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping,  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be a continuous map and  $A = \{x \in X : g(x) \in \Phi(x)\}$ . If  $g \upharpoonright A$  can be extended to a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$  for  $\Phi$ , then  $A$  must be closed.*

*Proof.* Follows from the fact that, in this case,  $A = \{x \in X : g(x) = f(x)\}$ .  $\square$

**3.4. Densely Compact-Valued Mappings.** For a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  and a subset  $A \subset X$ , let  $\Phi[A] = \bigcup_{x \in A} \Phi(x)$  (see Proposition 3.12).

**Proposition 3.16.** *Let  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  be an l.s.c. mapping and  $A \subset X$ . Then the set  $Z = \{x \in X : \Phi(x) \subset \overline{\Phi[A]}\}$  is closed in  $X$ . In particular,  $\Phi[A]$  is dense  $\Phi[X]$  whenever  $A$  is dense in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Simply observe that  $X \setminus Z = \Phi^{-1} [E \setminus \overline{\Phi[A]}]$  is open.  $\square$

This brings the following refined version of Question 7.

**Question 8.** Under the conditions of Question 7, suppose further that each nonempty open set  $U \subset X$  contains a point  $p \in U$  with  $\Phi(p) \in \mathcal{C}(E)$ , i.e. that  $\mathbf{C}_\Phi$  is dense in  $X$ , see (3.1). Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

Let us remark that if the answer to Question 8 is “Yes”, then by Theorem 3.11, so is the answer to Question 7. Finally, here is a bit more general question.

**Question 9.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that each nonempty open set  $U \subset X$  contains a point  $p \in U$  with  $\Phi(p) \in \mathcal{C}(E)$ . Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

**3.5. Extending Selections.** The following simple observation, obtained in [54, Example 1.3\*], shows that the selection-extension problem for l.s.c. mappings is equivalent to the selection problem for these mappings.

**Proposition 3.17** ([54]). *Let  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  be l.s.c.,  $A \subset X$  be closed and  $g : A \rightarrow Y$  be a continuous selection for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$ . Define  $\Phi_g : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  by  $\Phi_g(x) = \{g(x)\}$  if  $x \in A$ , and  $\Phi_g(x) = \Phi(x)$  otherwise. Then the mapping  $\Phi_g$  also l.s.c.*

This implies the following interpretation of Theorem 2.4.



**Theorem 3.18.** *Let  $X$  be paracompact,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping and  $\Omega_\Phi$  be the collection of all continuous selections for  $\Phi$ . Then  $\Phi(x) = \{f(x) : f \in \Omega_\Phi\}$ , for every  $x \in X$ .*

Precisely the same interpretation holds for Theorem 2.3 as well.

**Theorem 3.19.** *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping and  $\Omega_\Phi$  be the collection of all continuous selections for  $\Phi$ . Then  $\Phi(x) = \{f(x) : f \in \Omega_\Phi\}$ , for every  $x \in X$ .*

This brings the following natural question; see Theorems 3.9 and 3.11, also Proposition 3.12.

**Question 10.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping which has a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$ . If  $A \subset X$  is closed and  $g : A \rightarrow E$  is a continuous selection for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$ , then is it possible to extend  $g$  to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ?

## 4. Selections and Compact-Like Families

**4.1. A General Selection Problem.** The selection problem for collectionwise normal spaces has two aspects. The one is simply the question for a particular set-valued mapping.

**Question 11.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. When does there exist a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ?

The other question is about a particular family  $\mathcal{L}(E) \subset \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  with the property that every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$  has a continuous selection.

**Question 12.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space and  $E$  be a Banach space. Find a large enough subfamily  $\mathcal{L}(E) \subset \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  such that every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$  has a continuous selection?

Question 12 is rather general, and to make sense natural restrictions are in place. For instance, such a family should include Dowker's extension theorem (Theorem 2.1) in the sense of the construction in Proposition 2.2. Therefore, one natural requirement is that

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{C}'_c(E) \subset \mathcal{L}(E).$$

Another natural condition may come from the construction of approximate selections in Proposition 2.19. Namely, this proposition can be rephrased in the following way.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$  be l.s.c.,  $\eta : X \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  be continuous and  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be a continuous  $\eta$ -selection for  $\varphi$ . Then the mapping  $\overline{\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\eta[g]} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

Here, for a mapping  $\varphi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  and a function  $\eta : X \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ , the mapping  $\mathbf{O}_\eta[\varphi] : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is defined by  $\mathbf{O}_\eta[\varphi](x) = \mathbf{O}_{\eta(x)}(\varphi(x))$ ,  $x \in X$ . If  $\varphi$  is l.s.c. (in particular, a usual continuous map) and  $\eta$  is a lower semi-continuous function, then  $\mathbf{O}_\eta[\varphi]$  has an open graph [37, Proposition 2.1]; see Remark 2.20 where this was already used. Thus, by Propositions 2.9 and 2.10, the mapping  $\overline{\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\eta[g]}$  in Proposition 4.1 is also l.s.c. Hence, one can incorporate the property by considering the following further condition on the collection  $\mathcal{L}(E)$ .

$$(4.2) \quad \overline{S \cap \mathbf{O}_\delta(y)} \in \mathcal{L}(E), \text{ whenever } S \in \mathcal{L}(E) \text{ and } y \in \mathbf{O}_\delta(S) \text{ for some } \delta > 0.$$

Accordingly, we have the following refined version of Question 12.

**Question 13.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\mathcal{L}(E) \subset \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be as in (4.1) and (4.2). Then is it true that each l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$  has a continuous selection?

Let us point out that Question 13 is related to Question 6, see Remark 2.20. Indeed, let  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(E)$ ,  $\eta : X \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  and  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be as in Question 6. Then  $\overline{\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\eta[g]} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  is l.s.c. Moreover, if  $\mathcal{L}(E) \subset \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  satisfies (4.1) and (4.2), then  $\overline{\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\eta[g]} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$ . Thus, if the answer to Question 13 is “Yes”, then  $\overline{\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\eta[g]}$  has a continuous selection, and the answer to Question 6 will be “Yes” as well.

**4.2. A Necessary Condition.** Related to Question 12, the following interesting result was obtained by Nedev and Valov [71].

**Theorem 4.2** ([71]). *Let  $X$  be a normal space which is not countably paracompact,  $E$  be a Banach space, and  $\mathcal{L}(E) \subset \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be such that every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$  has a continuous selection. Then any decreasing sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{L}(E)$  has a nonempty intersection.*

*Proof.* We present the proof in [71, (b) of Theorem 1]. Contrary to the claim, suppose that  $\mathcal{L}(E)$  has a strictly decreasing sequence  $\{F_n\}$  with an empty intersection. So, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is a point  $z_n \in F_n \setminus F_{n+1}$ . Then the set  $H = \{z_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is closed and discrete in  $F_1$  because  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n = \emptyset$ . Next, for every  $y \in F_1$ , set  $m(y) = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : y \in F_n\}$  and define an l.s.c. mapping  $\varphi : F_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(H)$  by  $\varphi(y) = \{z_k : k \geq m(y)\}$ ,  $y \in F_1$ . Since  $F_1$  is paracompact (being metrizable), by a result of Michael [57],  $\varphi$  has a u.s.c. selection  $\psi : F_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(H)$ . On the other hand,  $X$  is normal but not countably paracompact. Hence, it has an increasing open cover  $\{U_n\}$  which doesn't admit a closed cover  $\{P_n\}$  with

$P_n \subset U_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Whenever  $x \in X$ , set  $n(x) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \in U_n\}$ , and define an l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$  by  $\Phi(x) = F_{n(x)}$ ,  $x \in X$ . By hypothesis,  $\Phi$  has a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$ . Finally, consider the composite mapping  $\theta = \psi \circ f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(H)$ , which is clearly u.s.c. So, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set  $P_n = \theta^{-1}[\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}] = f^{-1}(\psi^{-1}[\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}])$  is closed in  $X$ , and  $P_n \subset U_n$  because  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \subset F_n \setminus F_{n+1}$ . Indeed,  $x \in P_n$  implies that  $\psi(f(x)) \subset \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$  and, therefore,  $m(f(x)) \leq n$ , by the definition of  $\varphi$ . Accordingly,  $f(x) \notin F_{n+1}$  and, by the definition of  $\Phi$ , we get that  $n(x) \leq n$ . Thus,  $x \in U_{n(x)} \subset U_n$  and  $P_n \subset U_n$ . Since  $\{P_n\}$  is covering  $X$ , this is impossible.  $\square$

The following question is a partial case of a question stated in [71].

**Question 14** ([71]). Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space, and  $\mathcal{L}(E) \subset \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be such that  $\mathcal{C}'_c(E) \subset \mathcal{L}(E)$  and any decreasing sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{L}(E)$  has a nonempty intersection. Then, is it true that each l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$  has a continuous selection?

**Remark 4.3.** An elegant alternative proof of Theorem 4.2 was offered by the referee. Namely, take a decreasing sequence  $\{F_n\}$  of elements  $\mathcal{L}(E)$ . Since  $X$  is normal but not countably paracompact, there exists a decreasing sequence  $\{P_n\}$  of closed subsets of  $X$  such that  $P_1 = X$ ,  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n = \emptyset$  and  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n \neq \emptyset$ , for every sequence  $\{U_n\}$  of open subsets of  $X$  with  $P_n \subset U_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , see [24, Corollary 5.2.2]. Next, for every  $x \in X$ , let  $n(x) = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \in P_n\}$  which is a well-defined element of  $\mathbb{N}$  because  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n = \emptyset$ . Finally, define  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E)$  by  $\Phi(x) = F_{n(x)}$ ,  $x \in X$ . Then  $\Phi$  is l.s.c. and by hypothesis, it has a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$ . Since  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$  is closed and  $P_n \subset f^{-1}(\mathbf{O}_{1/n}(F_n))$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we get that

$$f^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n\right) = f^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{O}_{1/n}(F_n)\right) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}(\mathbf{O}_{1/n}(F_n)) \neq \emptyset.$$

Accordingly,  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n \neq \emptyset$  as required.  $\square$

**4.3. Selections and Reflexive Banach Spaces.** The property in Theorem 4.2 has the following natural interpretation in the setting of Banach spaces.

**Theorem 4.4** ([98]). *A normed space  $E$  is a reflexive Banach space if and only if every decreasing sequence of nonempty closed bounded convex subsets of  $E$  has a nonempty intersection.*

For reflexive Banach spaces, the following interesting result was obtained by Stoyan Nedev [70].

**Theorem 4.5** ([70]). *Whenever  $E$  is a reflexive Banach space, each l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : \omega_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

Here,  $\omega_1$  is the first uncountable ordinal endowed with the order topology. This result was further generalised in [14] by replacing  $\omega_1$  with an arbitrary suborderable space.

**Theorem 4.6** ([14]). *If  $X$  is a suborderable space and  $E$  is a reflexive Banach space, then each l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

*Suborderable spaces* are precisely the subspaces of orderable spaces, and are also called *generalised ordered*. Every suborderable space is countably paracompact and collectionwise normal, but not necessarily paracompact. For instance,  $\omega_1$  is not paracompact. Based on this, the following general question was stated in [14]; it is known as Choban-Gutnev-Nedev conjecture.

**Question 15** ([14]). Let  $X$  be a countably paracompact and collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Hilbert (or reflexive Banach) space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

**4.4. Norm-Minimal Selections.** Let  $E$  be a normed linear space. A selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$  for a mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow E$  is called *minimal* with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  of  $E$ , or *norm-minimal*, see [5], if

$$(4.3) \quad \|f(x)\| = \min \{\|y\| : y \in \Phi(x)\}, \quad \text{for every } x \in X.$$

A norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $E$  is called *locally uniformly rotund*, abbreviated *LUR*, if for each  $y \in E$  and sequence  $\{y_n\} \subset E$ ,

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n\| = \|y\|, \text{ and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n + y\| = 2\|y\|, \end{cases} \quad \text{implies} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n - y\| = 0.$$

If  $E$  is a normed space equipped with an LUR norm, then every nonempty closed convex subset of  $E$  has a unique point with a minimal norm, see [14, Lemma 4.1]. Accordingly, we have the following observation.

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $E$  be a normed space equipped with an LUR norm. Then each mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a unique norm-minimal selection.*

Regarding continuity of norm-minimal selections, the following characterisation was obtained in [40, Theorem 4.1]. In this theorem,  $\mathbb{B}$  is the closed unit ball of a normed space  $E$  equipped with a norm  $\|\cdot\|$ .

**Theorem 4.8** ([40]). *Let  $X$  be a space and  $E$  be a normed space equipped with an LUR norm. Then for an l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$ , the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\Phi^{-1}[\varepsilon \mathbb{B}]$  is closed in  $X$ , for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .
- (b)  $\Phi$  admits a continuous norm-minimal selection.

As for normed spaces which admit an equivalent LUR norm, let us explicitly state the famous Troyanski's renorming theorem [95, Theorem 1].

**Theorem 4.9** ([95]). *Every reflexive Banach space admits a topologically equivalent LUR norm.*

Based on this theorem and norm-minimal selections, the following interesting result about Question 15 was obtained by Shishkov [86, Proposition 1.1].

**Theorem 4.10** ([86]). *Let  $E$  be a reflexive Banach space and  $X$  be a space such that each weak  $\theta$ -cover of  $X$  has an open locally finite refinement. Then every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

Here, a cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  is called a *weak  $\theta$ -cover* if  $\mathcal{U}$  is a countable union of open families  $\mathcal{U}_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for each  $x \in X$ , there exists some  $k(x) \in \mathbb{N}$  for which the family  $\mathcal{U}_{k(x)}$  has a positive finite order at  $x$ , namely

$$0 < |\{U \in \mathcal{U}_{k(x)} : x \in U\}| < +\infty.$$

The following example was given in the same paper of Shishkov, see [86, Theorem 1.2].

**Example 4.11** ([86]). *If  $X$  is a countably paracompact and hereditarily collectionwise normal space, then each weak  $\theta$ -cover of  $X$  has an open locally finite refinement.*

Example 4.11 implies that Theorem 4.10 is a natural generalisation of Theorem 4.6 because each suborderable space is countably paracompact and hereditarily collectionwise normal. In fact, Theorem 4.10 is a potential candidate for the affirmative solution of Question 15 in view of the following characterisation of countably paracompact collectionwise normal spaces claimed in [90].

**Theorem 4.12** ([90]). *A space  $X$  is countably paracompact and collectionwise normal if and only if each weak  $\theta$ -cover of  $X$  has an open locally finite refinement.*

However, as pointed out in [86], the proof of Theorem 4.12 in [90] is incomplete, which suggests the following separate question.

**Question 16.** *Let  $X$  be a countably paracompact collectionwise normal space and  $\mathcal{U}$  be a weak  $\theta$ -cover of  $X$ . Is it true that  $\mathcal{U}$  has an open locally finite refinement?*

**4.5. Selections and Hilbert Spaces.** In case of Hilbert spaces, Question 15 was resolved in the affirmative by Ivailo Shishkov in 2005, his paper with the final solution appeared in print in [88].

**Theorem 4.13** ([88]). *A space  $X$  is countably paracompact and collectionwise normal iff for every Hilbert space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

The role of countable paracompactness in Theorem 4.13 is the equivalence stated in Proposition 2.16, while the essential selection property of collectionwise normality was obtained in [88, Theorem 1.3].

**Theorem 4.14** ([88]). *If  $X$  is a collectionwise normal space and  $E$  is a Hilbert space, then each bounded l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection.*

Here are two consequences of Theorem 4.14, which may shed some light on the role of Hilbert spaces in the selection problem for collectionwise normal spaces. The first one shows that the answer to Question 5 is “Yes” provided the range  $E$  is a Hilbert space.

**Corollary 4.15.** *Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Hilbert space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. If  $\Phi$  has a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then  $\Phi$  also has a continuous selection.*

*Proof.* Let  $g : X \rightarrow E$  be a continuous  $\varepsilon$ -selection for  $\Phi$ , for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Just as in Remark 2.20, consider the l.s.c. mapping  $\overline{\Phi \wedge \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon[g]} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  which is bounded-valued. Hence, by Theorem 4.14, it has a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$ . Evidently,  $f$  is also a selection for  $\Phi$ .  $\square$

The other consequence should be compared with the characterisation of PF-normality in Theorem 2.5.

**Corollary 4.16.** *Let  $X$  be a space such that for every Hilbert space  $E$ , every bounded l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has a continuous selection. Then  $X$  is collectionwise normal.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a discrete collection of nonempty closed subsets of  $X$ , and  $\ell_2(\mathcal{D})$  be the Hilbert space of all functions  $y : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} [y(D)]^2 < \infty$ , where the linear operations are defined pointwise and the norm is  $\|y\| = \sqrt{\sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} [y(D)]^2}$ . Set  $A = \bigcup \mathcal{D}$ , and define a map  $g : A \rightarrow \ell_2(\mathcal{D})$  by  $g(x) = \chi_D : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  to be the characteristic function of the unique  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  with  $x \in D$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}$  is closed and discrete,  $A$  is a closed subset of  $X$  and  $g$  is continuous. Moreover,  $g$  takes values in the closed unit ball  $\mathbb{B}$  of  $\ell_2(\mathcal{D})$  because  $\|\chi_D\| = 1$ , for each  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ . Finally, let  $\Phi_g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(\mathbb{B}) \subset \mathcal{F}_c(\ell_2(\mathcal{D}))$  be as in Proposition 2.2 with  $Y$  replaced by  $\mathbb{B}$ . Then  $\Phi_g$  is both l.s.c. and is bounded-valued. Hence, by hypothesis, it has a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow \ell_2(\mathcal{D})$ , which is a continuous extension of  $g$ , by Proposition 2.2. Since  $\{\chi_D : D \in \mathcal{D}\}$  is a closed discrete set in  $\ell_2(\mathcal{D})$  (actually, uniformly discrete with respect to the norm), there exists a discrete collection  $\{\mathcal{U}_D : D \in \mathcal{D}\}$  of open subsets of  $\ell_2(\mathcal{D})$  with  $\chi_D \in \mathcal{U}_D$ , for each  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ . Then  $U_D = f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_D)$ ,  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ , is a discrete collection of open subsets of  $X$  such that  $D \subset U_D$ , for each  $D \in \mathcal{D}$ . Accordingly,  $X$  is collectionwise normal.  $\square$

**4.6. Selections and  $\ell_p(\mathcal{A})$ -spaces.** For a set  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $p \geq 1$ , let  $\ell_p(\mathcal{A})$  be the Banach space of all functions  $y : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |y(\alpha)|^p < \infty$ , where the linear operations are defined pointwise and the norm is  $\|y\|_p = \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |y(\alpha)|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ . Since every Hilbert space is isomorphic to  $\ell_2(\mathcal{A})$  for some set  $\mathcal{A}$ , Theorem 4.13 can be restated in the following terms.

**Theorem 4.17** ([88]). *For a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a)  *$X$  is countably paracompact and collectionwise normal.*
- (b) *For every set  $\mathcal{A}$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(\ell_2(\mathcal{A}))$  has a continuous selection.*

Similarly, the characterisation of paracompactness in Theorem 2.4 can be restated in terms of the Banach space  $\ell_1(\mathcal{A})$ . The following theorem is actually reassembling the proof of Theorem 2.4.

**Theorem 4.18** ([54]). *For a space  $X$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *Every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  has a locally finite open refinement.*
- (b) *For every set  $\mathcal{U}$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(\ell_1(\mathcal{U}))$  has a continuous selection.*
- (c) *Every open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  has an index-subordinated partition of unity.*

Here, a collection  $\xi_U : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , of continuous functions on a space  $X$  is a *partition of unity* if  $\sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \xi_U(x) = 1$ , for each  $x \in X$ . A partition of unity  $\{\xi_U : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$  is *index-subordinated* to a cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  if  $X \setminus U \subset \xi_U^{-1}(0)$ , for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ . The following natural result may explain the relationship between partitions of unity, index-subordinated to open covers  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ , and continuous selections  $f : X \rightarrow \ell_1(\mathcal{U})$ , see Theorem 4.18. The result itself was obtained in the implication (f)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) of [64, Theorem 1.2] and was explicitly stated in [23, Proposition 5.4]; the case of locally finite partitions of unity was obtained in the proof of [76, Theorem 1].

**Lemma 4.19.** *Let  $X$  be a space and  $\xi_\alpha : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ , be a collection of functions. Then  $\{\xi_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$  is a partition of unity on  $X$  if and only if the diagonal map  $\xi = \Delta_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \xi_\alpha : X \rightarrow \ell_1(\mathcal{A})$  is continuous and satisfies  $\|\xi(x)\|_1 = 1$ , for every  $x \in X$ .*

Theorems 4.17 and 4.18 reveal an interesting role of the spaces  $\ell_1(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\ell_2(\mathcal{A})$  in the selection theory. In this regard, let us recall that all Banach spaces  $\ell_p(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $1 \leq p < +\infty$ , are homeomorphic, and it is well known that  $\ell_1(\mathcal{A})$  is not reflexive, but each  $\ell_p(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $1 < p < +\infty$ , is reflexive. In fact, each infinite-dimensional reflexive Banach space is homeomorphic to  $\ell_1(\mathcal{A})$ , for some  $\mathcal{A}$ , see e.g. [6, Theorem 4.1 in §4 of Chapter VII]. This brings the following natural partial case of Question 15.

**Question 17.** Let  $X$  be a countably paracompact collectionwise normal space, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(\ell_p(\mathcal{A}))$  be an l.s.c. mapping for some  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $1 < p < +\infty$  with  $p \neq 2$ . Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

Going back to Question 15, the interested reader may consult some of the papers of Shishkov ([83, 84, 85, 86, 87]), which contain several interesting ideas.

## 5. Selections and Finite-Dimensional Spaces

**5.1. Selection Extension and Approximation Properties.** Let  $n \geq -1$ . A family  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a space  $Y$  is *equi- $LC^n$*  [55] if every neighbourhood  $U$  of a point  $y \in \bigcup \mathcal{S}$  contains a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $y$  such that for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , every continuous map  $g : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow V \cap S$  of the  $k$ -sphere  $\mathbb{S}^k$ ,  $k \leq n$ , can be extended to a continuous map  $h : \mathbb{B}^{k+1} \rightarrow U \cap S$  of the  $(k+1)$ -ball  $\mathbb{B}^{k+1}$ . A space  $S$  is  $C^n$  if for every  $k \leq n$ , every continuous map  $g : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow S$  can be extended to a continuous map  $h : \mathbb{B}^{k+1} \rightarrow S$ . In these terms, a family  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of  $Y$  is *equi- $LC^{-1}$*  if it consists of nonempty subsets; similarly, each nonempty subset  $S \subset Y$  is  $C^{-1}$ .

A mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  has the *Selection Extension Property* (or *SEP*) at a closed subset  $A \subset X$  [59] if every continuous selection  $g : A \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$  can be extended to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ . If  $g$  only extends to a continuous selection for  $\Phi \upharpoonright U$  for some neighbourhood  $U$  of  $A$  in  $X$ , then  $\Phi$  is said to have the *Selection Neighbourhood Extension Property* (or *SNEP*) at  $A$  [59]. If this holds for any closed set of  $X$ , then we simply say that  $\Phi$  has the SEP, or the SNEP.

For a subset  $Z \subset X$ , we write  $\dim_X(Z) \leq m$  to express that the covering dimension  $\dim(S) \leq m$ , for every  $S \subset Z$  which is closed in  $X$ , see [55]. Let us remark that for a normal space  $X$ ,  $\dim_X(Z) \leq m$  is valid if either  $\dim(Z) \leq m$  or  $\dim(X) \leq m$ . The following theorem was obtained in [55, Theorem 1.2] and is commonly called the *finite-dimensional selection theorem*.

**Theorem 5.1** ([55]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $A \subset X$  be a closed set with  $\dim_X(X \setminus A) \leq n + 1$ ,  $Y$  be a completely metrizable space and  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an equi- $LC^n$  family. Then every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  has the SNEP at  $A$ . If, moreover, each  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  is  $C^n$ , then  $\Phi$  also has the SEP at  $A$ .*

The proof of Theorem 5.1 in [55] is based on a uniform version of the same theorem. To this end, let us recall that a family  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$  is *uniformly equi- $LC^n$* , where  $n \geq -1$ , if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that, for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , every continuous map of the  $k$ -sphere ( $k \leq n$ ) in  $S$  of diameter  $< \delta(\varepsilon)$  can be extended to continuous map of the  $(k+1)$ -ball into a subset of  $S$  of diameter  $< \varepsilon$  [55]. The relation with equi- $LC^n$  families is given by the following embedding property stated in [55, Theorem 3.1], see also [55, Proposition 2.1] and [22, Theorem 1].



**Theorem 5.2** ([55]). *Let  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an equi- $LC^n$  family of subsets of a completely metrizable space  $Y$ . Then  $\bigcup \mathcal{S}$  can be embedded into a Banach space  $E$  so that  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}(E)$  is a uniformly equi- $LC^n$  family of subsets of  $E$ .*

The other reduction in the proof of Theorem 5.1 is that the properties “SNEP” and “SEP” are obtained by the following uniform selection approximation property [55, Theorem 4.1].

**Theorem 5.3** ([55]). *Let  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space and  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be uniformly equi- $LC^n$ . Then to every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there corresponds  $\gamma(\varepsilon) > 0$  with the following property: If  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  is an l.s.c. mapping from a paracompact space  $X$  with  $\dim(X) \leq n+1$ , then for every continuous  $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ -selection  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi$ , there exists a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi$  such that  $\rho(f(x), g(x)) < \varepsilon$ , for all  $x \in X$ . Moreover, if each  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  is  $C^n$ , then one can take  $\gamma(+\infty) = +\infty$ .*

**5.2. Hybrid Selection Theorems.** As a common generalisation of Theorems 2.4 and 5.1, the following two theorems were obtained in [59].

**Theorem 5.4** ([59]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $Z \subset X$  with  $\dim_X(Z) \leq n+1$ , and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping with  $\Phi(x)$  convex for all  $x \in X \setminus Z$ , and with  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in Z\}$  uniformly equi- $LC^n$ . Then  $\Phi$  has the SNEP. If, moreover,  $\Phi(x)$  is  $C^n$  for every  $x \in Z$ , then  $\Phi$  has the SEP.*

To state the other theorem, let us recall that a family  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a space  $Y$  is equi- $LC^n$  in  $Y$  [59] if every neighbourhood  $U$  of a point  $y \in Y$  contains a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $y$  such that for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , every continuous  $g : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow V \cap S$ , for  $k \leq n$ , can be extended to a continuous  $h : \mathbb{B}^{k+1} \rightarrow U \cap S$ . Each family of subsets of  $Y$  which is equi- $LC^n$  in  $Y$  is also equi- $LC^n$ , but the converse is not necessarily true. Here is a simple example.

**Example 5.5.** For every positive real number  $t > 0$ , let

$$S_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| \geq t\} = (-\infty, -t] \cup [t, +\infty).$$

Then  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_t : t > 0\}$  is equi- $LC^n$  for all  $n \geq -1$ , but is not equi- $LC^0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

Finally, let us also recall that a metrizable space  $Y$  is an *AR* (respectively, *ANR*) if it is a retract (respectively, neighbourhood retract) of every metric space  $E$  containing it as a closed subset.

**Theorem 5.6** ([59]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $Y$  be a completely metrizable ANR,  $Z \subset X$  with  $\dim_X(Z) \leq n+1$ , and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping with  $\Phi(x) = Y$  for all  $x \in X \setminus Z$ , and with  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in Z\}$  equi- $LC^n$  in  $Y$ . Then  $\Phi$  has the SNEP. If, moreover,  $Y$  is an AR and  $\Phi(x)$  is  $C^n$  for every  $x \in Z$ , then  $\Phi$  has the SEP.*

We proceed with an example showing that Theorem 5.4 fails if in this theorem the collection  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in Z\}$  is assumed to be only equi- $LC^n$ .

**Example 5.7.** Let  $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be the closed unit disk in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , and  $\mathbb{S}$  be the unit circle. Also, let  $S_y = \{(s, t) : s^2 + t^2 = 1 \text{ and } t \geq y\}$ , for every  $-1 < y \leq 1$ . Define  $\Phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  by letting for  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{D}$  that

$$\Phi(x, y) = \begin{cases} \{(x, y)\} & \text{if } (x, y) \in \mathbb{S}, \\ S_y & \text{if } (x, y) \notin \mathbb{S}. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\Phi$  is l.s.c., but has no continuous selection because each such selection will be a retraction  $r : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ . However, each  $\Phi(x, y)$ ,  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{S}$ , is convex being a singleton. Moreover, the collection  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_y : -1 < y \leq 1\}$  of arcs is equi- $LC^n$  for every  $n \geq -1$ , and each element of  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $C^n$ . Finally, we also have that  $\dim_{\mathbb{D}}(\mathbb{D} \setminus \mathbb{S}) = \dim(\mathbb{D} \setminus \mathbb{S}) = 2$ .  $\square$

The case when the family in Theorem 5.4 is assumed to be equi- $LC^n$  in  $E$  is not covered by this example, which brings the following question.

**Question 18.** Is Theorem 5.4 still valid if in this theorem “uniformly equi- $LC^n$ ” is replaced by “equi- $LC^n$  in  $E$ ”?

This also brings a similar question about Theorem 5.6 of whether this theorem is still valid if “equi- $LC^n$  in  $Y$ ” is replaced by “equi- $LC^n$ ”. This doesn’t seem likely, but is not covered by Example 5.7.

Let us remark that in the special case of  $n = -1$ , Theorem 5.6 is covered by Theorem 5.4, see the remark after the proof of Theorem 5.6 in [59]. Moreover, if  $Y$  and  $\Phi$  are as in Theorem 5.6, then by [59, Lemma 6.1],  $Y$  can be embedded as a closed subset in a Banach space  $E$  such that

- (i)  $Y$  is a *uniform ANR* (respectively, *uniform AR*) of  $E$ , and
- (ii)  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in Z\}$  is uniformly equi- $LC^n$  in  $E$ .

Here, a closed subset  $Y \subset E$  is a *uniform ANR* of  $E$  [58] if to every  $\varepsilon > 0$  corresponds some  $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$  and a retraction  $r : \mathbf{O}_{\delta(\infty)}(Y) \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\|z - r(z)\| < \varepsilon$ , whenever  $z \in \mathbf{O}_{\delta(\varepsilon)}(Y)$ . If one can take  $\delta(\infty) = \infty$  (so that the domain of  $r$  is always  $E$ ), then  $Y$  is called a *uniform AR* of  $E$ . Accordingly, Theorem 5.6 can be reformulated in the following way.

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $Y \subset E$  be a closed subset of  $E$  which is a uniform ANR of  $E$ ,  $Z \subset X$  with  $\dim_X(Z) \leq n + 1$ , and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping with  $\Phi(x) = Y$  for all  $x \in X \setminus Z$ , and with  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in Z\}$  uniformly equi- $LC^n$ . Then  $\Phi$  has the SNEP. If, moreover,  $Y$  is a uniform AR of  $E$  and  $\Phi(x)$  is  $C^n$  for every  $x \in Z$ , then  $\Phi$  has the SEP.*

This makes Theorems 5.4 and 5.6 further similar in the following sense. If  $\Phi$  is as in Theorem 5.4, then the l.s.c. mapping  $\tilde{\Phi} = \overline{\text{conv}[\Phi]} : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  has the SEP, see Theorem 3.18. If  $\Phi$  is as in Theorem 5.8, then the constant mapping  $\tilde{\Phi}(x) = Y$ ,  $x \in X$ , has the SNEP, and also the SEP provided  $Y$  is a uniform

AR of  $E$ . Moreover, in both cases, the pair  $(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi})$  of mappings has the following properties:

- (5.1)  $\Phi$  is an l.s.c. set-valued selection for  $\tilde{\Phi}$ ;
- (5.2)  $\dim_X (\{x \in X : \Phi(x) \neq \tilde{\Phi}(x)\}) \leq n + 1$ ;
- (5.3)  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X \text{ and } \Phi(x) \neq \tilde{\Phi}(x)\}$  is uniformly equi- $LC^n$  in  $E$ .

This motivates the following further question.

**Question 19.** Let  $X$  be a paracompact space and  $E$  be a Banach space. Suppose that  $(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi}) : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  is a pair of mappings as in (5.1), (5.2) and (5.3). Does  $\Phi$  have the SNEP provided so does  $\tilde{\Phi}$ ? Similarly, does  $\Phi$  have the SEP provided  $\tilde{\Phi}$  has the SEP and  $\Phi(x)$  is  $C^n$ , for every  $x \in X$  with  $\Phi(x) \neq \tilde{\Phi}(x)$ ?

**5.3. Selection Homotopy Extension Properties.** The following selection interpretation of the Borsuk homotopy extension theorem [8] was obtained by Michael, see [56, Theorem 3.4].

**Theorem 5.9** ([56]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $A \subset X$  be a closed set with  $\dim_X(X \setminus A) \leq n$ ,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space, and  $\Phi : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be a quasi-continuous mapping such that  $\{\Phi(p) : p \in X \times [0, 1]\}$  is uniformly equi- $LC^n$ . Then  $\Phi$  has the SEP at  $X \times \{0\} \cup A \times [0, 1]$ .*

Here, a mapping  $\Phi : X \times [0, 1] \rightsquigarrow Y$ , into a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$ , is *quasi-continuous* if it is l.s.c. and for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , each point of  $X \times [0, 1]$  has a neighbourhood  $U$  such that  $\Phi(x, s) \subset \mathbf{O}_\varepsilon(\Phi(x, t))$ , whenever  $(x, s), (x, t) \in U$  with  $s \leq t$ . The interested reader is referred to [33, 34, 36], where Theorem 5.9 was refined and generalised in various directions.

Let  $\Phi : X \times [0, 1] \rightsquigarrow Y$ . A mapping  $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  is a  $\Phi$ -homotopy if it is a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ , and  $H$  is a  $\Phi$ -homotopy of  $f : X \times \{0\} \rightarrow Y$  if it is also a continuous extension of  $f$ . The mapping  $\Phi : X \times [0, 1] \rightsquigarrow Y$  is said to have the *Selection Homotopy Extension Property* at a subset  $A \subset X$ , or the *SHEP* at  $A$ , if whenever  $f : X \times \{0\} \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous selection for  $\Phi \upharpoonright X \times \{0\}$ , every  $\Phi \upharpoonright A \times [0, 1]$ -homotopy  $G : A \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  of  $f \upharpoonright A \times \{0\}$  can be extended to a  $\Phi$ -homotopy  $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  of  $f$ . For instance, the mapping  $\Phi$  in Theorem 5.9 has the SHEP at  $A$ .

Theorem 5.9 has a nice interpretation for set-valued mappings  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  defined only on  $X$ . In this case, we will say that a mapping  $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  is a  $\Phi$ -homotopy if  $H(x, t) \in \Phi(x)$ , for every  $x \in X$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ . In particular, a selection  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  will be called  $\Phi$ -homotopic to a selection  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  if  $f$  and  $g$  are homotopic by a  $\Phi$ -homotopy  $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$ . In these terms, we have the following consequence of Theorem 5.9.

**Corollary 5.10.** *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $A \subset X$  be a closed set with  $\dim_X(X \setminus A) \leq n$ ,  $Y$  be a completely metrizable space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X \setminus A\}$  is equi- $LC^n$  in  $Y$ . Also, let  $g, h : A \rightarrow Y$  be continuous selections for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$  which are  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$ -homotopic. If one of these selections can be extended to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ , then so does the other in such a way that both selection remain  $\Phi$ -homotopic.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $g$  can be extended to a continuous selection  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi$ , and take a  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$ -homotopy  $G : A \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  between  $g$  and  $h$ , say  $G(x, 0) = g(x)$  and  $G(x, 1) = h(x)$ , for every  $x \in A$ . For convenience, define a continuous map  $u : X \times \{0\} \cup A \times [0, 1] \rightarrow E$  by  $u(x, t) = G(x, t)$  for  $(x, t) \in A \times [0, 1]$ , and  $u(x, 0) = f(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ . Next, define a mapping  $\Phi_u : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  by  $\Phi_u(x, t) = \{u(x, t)\}$  if  $(x, t) \in X \times \{0\} \cup A \times [0, 1]$ , and  $\Phi_u(x, t) = \Phi(x)$  otherwise. Then the family  $\{\Phi_u(x, t) : (x, t) \in X \times [0, 1]\}$  remains equi- $LC^n$  in  $Y$ . Hence,  $Y$  admits a complete compatible metric  $\rho$  so that this family is uniformly equi- $LC^n$  with respect to  $\rho$ , see Theorem 5.2. Moreover,  $\Phi_u$  is l.s.c. because so is  $\Phi$ , see Proposition 3.17. In fact, it is easy to see that  $\Phi_u$  is quasi-continuous. Thus, by Theorem 5.9,  $u$  can be extended to a continuous selection  $H : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi_u$ . This  $H$  is a  $\Phi$ -homotopy between  $f$  and a continuous extension of the selection  $h$ .  $\square$

**5.4. Selections and Weak Deformation Retracts.** A closed subset  $A \subset X$  of a space  $X$  is called a *weak deformation retract* of  $X$  if there exists a continuous  $r : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  such that

$$\begin{cases} r(x, 1) = x & \text{for every } x \in X, \\ r(x, 0) \in A & \text{for every } x \in X, \\ r(x, 0) = x & \text{for every } x \in A. \end{cases}$$

The following theorem was proved by Michael [56, Theorem 6.1].

**Theorem 5.11** ([56]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space with  $\dim(X) \leq n + 1$ ,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space,  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be a uniformly equi- $LC^n$  family,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  be a  $\rho$ -continuous mapping and  $A \subset X$  be a weak deformation retract of  $X$ . Then every continuous selection  $g : A \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi \upharpoonright A$  can be extended to a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ .*

Let us remark that, in contrast to Theorem 5.1, here there is no requirement that each  $\Phi(x)$  is  $C^n$ . Regarding the condition  $\dim(X) \leq n + 1$ , the following question was stated by Michael in [56].

**Question 20** ([56]). Does Theorem 5.11 remain true if  $\dim(X) \leq n + 1$  is replaced by the weaker requirement that  $\dim_X(X \setminus A) \leq n + 1$ ?

As commented by Michael, see [56, Theorem 6.2], the answer to Question 20 is “Yes” provided the condition on  $A$  is strengthened to the existence of a continuous  $r : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  such that

$$\begin{cases} r(x, 1) = x & \text{for every } x \in X, \\ r(x, 0) \in A & \text{for every } x \in X, \\ r(x, t) \in A & \text{for every } x \in A \text{ and } 0 \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

## 6. Selections and Infinite-Dimensional Spaces

**6.1. Selections and Countable Dimensionality.** Another hybrid selection theorem representing a common generalisation of Theorems 2.4 and 5.1 was obtained in [59, Theorem 1.4].

**Theorem 6.1** ([59]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $A \subset X$  be a closed set with  $\dim_X(X \setminus A) \leq n + 1$ ,  $Z \subset X \setminus A$  with  $\dim_X(Z) \leq m + 1$ , where  $m \leq n$ ,  $Y$  be a completely metrizable space, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X \setminus Z\}$  is equi- $LC^n$  in  $Y$  and  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in Z\}$  is equi- $LC^m$  in  $Y$ . Then  $\Phi$  has the SNEP at  $A$ . If, moreover,  $\Phi(x)$  is  $C^n$  for all  $x \in X \setminus Z$  and  $C^m$  for all  $x \in Z$ , then  $\Phi$  has the SEP at  $A$ .*

Subsequently, Theorem 6.1 was generalised by replacing  $Z$  with finitely many such sets, see [2]. The case of infinitely many sets seems to offer an interesting question, which is discussed below.

The *local dimension*  $\text{locdim}(X)$  of a space  $X$  was introduced by Dowker [18] as the least number  $n$  such that each point of  $X$  is contained in an open set  $U$  with  $\dim(U) \leq n$ . It was shown in [18] that  $\text{locdim}(X) \leq \dim(X)$  for every normal space  $X$ , but there exists a normal space  $X$  with  $\text{locdim}(X) < \dim(X)$ .

**Theorem 6.2** ([18]). *If  $X$  is a paracompact space, then  $\text{locdim}(X) = \dim(X)$ .*

Subsequently, Wenner [99] generalised the local dimension and introduced the so called locally finite-dimensional spaces. A space  $X$  is *locally finite-dimensional* [99] if each point  $p \in X$  has a finite-dimensional neighbourhood. In these terms, a normal space  $X$  is locally finite-dimensional if each point  $p \in X$  is contained in an open set  $U \subset X$  with  $\dim(\overline{U}) < \infty$ ; equivalently, if each  $p \in X$  has a neighbourhood  $U \subset X$  with  $\dim_X(U) < \infty$ .

A space  $X$  is *countable-dimensional* if it is a countable union of finite-dimensional subsets [67]. A space  $X$  is *strongly countable-dimensional* if it is a countable union of closed finite-dimensional subsets [67]. Each strongly countable-dimensional space is countable-dimensional, but the converse is not necessarily true [67, Example 5.2]. Each locally finite-dimensional metrizable space is strongly countable-dimensional [99, Theorem 1]. Essentially the same proof remains valid for locally finite-dimensional paracompact spaces.

**Theorem 6.3** ([99]). *Every locally finite-dimensional paracompact space is strongly countable-dimensional.*

On the other hand, let us remark that there exists a strongly countable-dimensional metrizable space which is not locally finite-dimensional [99, Theorem 4].

Regarding selections and locally finite-dimensional spaces, the following natural “infinite-dimensional” version of Theorem 5.1 can be obtained following the proof of [54, Theorem 8.2], see also [60, Theorem 6.2].

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let  $X$  be a locally finite-dimensional paracompact space,  $Y$  be a completely metrizable space, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X\}$  is equi- $LC^n$  for each  $n \geq -1$ . Then  $\Phi$  has the SNEP. If, moreover,  $\Phi(x)$  is  $C^n$  for every  $x \in X$  and  $n \geq -1$ , then  $\Phi$  has the SEP.*

A space  $S$  is called  $C^\omega$ , or *aspherical*, if every continuous map  $g : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow S$ ,  $k \geq -1$ , can be extended to a continuous map  $h : \mathbb{B}^{k+1} \rightarrow S$ . We shall say that a family  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}(Y)$  of subsets of a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$  is *uniformly equi- $LC^\omega$*  if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that, for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ , every continuous map of the  $k$ -sphere ( $k \geq -1$ ) in  $S$  of diameter  $< \delta(\varepsilon)$  can be extended to continuous map of the  $(k + 1)$ -ball into a subset of  $S$  of diameter  $< \varepsilon$ .

In view of Theorems 6.3 and 6.4, the following question seems natural.

**Question 21.** Let  $X$  be a strongly countable-dimensional paracompact space,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X\}$  is uniformly equi- $LC^\omega$  and each  $\Phi(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , is  $C^\omega$ . Does there exist a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ?

Suppose that  $X$ ,  $Y$  and  $\Phi$  are as in Question 21. Then  $X = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} F_n$ , for some increasing sequence of closed sets  $F_n \subset X$  with  $\dim(F_n) \leq n$ . Thus, inductively, using Theorem 5.1, one can construct a selection  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  for  $\Phi$  such that  $f \upharpoonright F_n$  is continuous, for every  $n \geq 0$ . However, the challenge presented in this question is to make the construction so that the resulting  $f$  will be also continuous.

**6.2. Selections and  $C$ -spaces.** A space  $X$  has property  $C$ , or  $X$  is a  $C$ -space, if for any sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of open covers of  $X$  there exists a sequence  $\{\mathcal{V}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of open pairwise-disjoint families in  $X$  such that each  $\mathcal{V}_n$  refines  $\mathcal{U}_n$  and  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{V}_n$  is a cover of  $X$ . The  $C$ -space property was originally defined by W. Haver [46] for compact metric spaces, subsequently Addis and Gresham [1] reformulated Haver’s definition for arbitrary spaces. It should be remarked that a  $C$ -space  $X$  is paracompact if and only if it is countably paracompact and normal, see e.g. [26, Proposition 1.3]. Every finite-dimensional paracompact space, as well as every countable-dimensional metrizable space, is a  $C$ -space [1], but there exists a compact metric  $C$ -space which is not countable-dimensional [73].

A set-valued mapping  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  is called *lower locally constant* [37] if the set  $\{x \in X : K \subset \Phi(x)\}$  is open in  $X$ , for every compact subset  $K \subset Y$ . This property appeared in a paper of Uspenskij [96]; later on, it was used by some authors (see, for instance, [10, 97]) under the name “strongly l.s.c.”, while in papers of other authors strongly l.s.c. was already used for a different property of set-valued mappings (see, for instance, [32]). Clearly, every lower locally constant mapping is l.s.c. but the converse fails in general and counterexamples abound. In fact, if we consider a single-valued map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  as a set-valued one, then  $f$  is l.s.c. if and only if it is continuous, while  $f$  will be lower locally constant if and only if it is locally constant. Thus, the term “lower locally constant” provides some natural analogy with the single-valued case.

The following theorem was obtained by Uspenskij [96].

**Theorem 6.5** ([96]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact  $C$ -space,  $Y$  be a topological space, and  $\Phi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  be a lower locally constant mapping with aspherical values. Then  $\Phi$  has a continuous selection.*

In view of the method for proving Theorem 5.1, the above selection theorem can be considered as a “selection approximation property” for the case of l.s.c. mappings, see Proposition 2.11. This brings the following natural question.

**Question 22.** Let  $X$  be a paracompact  $C$ -space,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. What conditions on the family  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X\}$  will guarantee the existence of a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ? What if  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X\}$  is uniformly equi- $LC^\omega$  and each  $\Phi(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , is  $C^\omega$ ?

Turning to stronger properties in the setting of this question, let us recall that a metrizable space  $S$  is an *Absolute Extensor* for the metrizable spaces, or shortly an *AE*, if every continuous map from a closed subset  $A$  of a metrizable space  $X$  into  $S$  can be extended to a continuous map of  $X$  into  $S$ . If every continuous map from a closed subset  $A$  of a metrizable space  $X$  into  $S$  can be extended to a continuous map in  $S$  over some neighbourhood of  $A$  in  $X$ , then  $S$  is called an *ANE*. A collection  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$  is called *uniformly equi-LAE* (*Local Absolute Extensor*) [72] if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $g$  is a continuous map from a closed subset  $A$  of a metrizable space  $X$  into any  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $\text{diam}(g(A)) < \delta$ , then it has a continuous extension  $f : X \rightarrow S$  with  $\text{diam}(f(X)) < \varepsilon$ . A collection  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$  is called *uniformly equi-LC* (*Locally Contractible*) [72] if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $p \in S \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mathbf{O}_\delta(p) \cap S$  is contractible over a subset of  $S$  of diameter  $< \varepsilon$ . Clearly,  $S$  is an AE implies that  $S$  is  $C^\omega$ , and each uniformly equi-LAE family  $\mathcal{S}$  is equi- $LC^\omega$ . Moreover, the following was shown by Pixley [72, Theorem 3.1].

**Theorem 6.6** ([72]). *For a collection  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$ , the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *The collection  $\mathcal{S}$  is uniformly equi-LAE.*
- (b) *Each  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  is an ANE and  $\mathcal{S}$  is uniformly equi-LC.*

Regarding the role of such properties in the selection problem for l.s.c. mappings, the following example was given by Pixley [72, Theorem 1.1].

**Theorem 6.7** ([72]). *Let  $\mathbf{Q} = [0, 1]^\omega$  be the Hilbert cube. Then there exists an l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Q})$  such that*

- (i) *The collection  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in \mathbf{Q}\}$  is uniformly equi-LC,*
- (ii) *Each  $\Phi(x)$ ,  $x \in \mathbf{Q}$ , is either a point, or homeomorphic to a  $k$ -cell (for some  $k \geq 1$ ), or homeomorphic to  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,*
- (iii) *There is no continuous selection for  $\Phi$ . In fact,  $\Phi$  has no the SNEP at some singleton of  $\mathbf{Q}$ .*

Uniformly equi-LAE families are another candidate to try Question 22.

**Question 23.** Let  $X$  be a paracompact  $C$ -space,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X\}$  is uniformly equi-LAE and each  $\Phi(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , is AE. Does there exist a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ?

Let  $|\Sigma|$  be the geometric realisation of a simplicial complex  $\Sigma$ , and  $\mathbf{V}_\Sigma$  be its vertices. As a topological space, we will consider  $|\Sigma|$  endowed with the *Whitehead topology*. In this topology, a subset  $U \subset |\Sigma|$  is open if and only if  $U \cap |\sigma|$  is open in  $|\sigma|$ , for every simplex  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ . Motivated by the Lefschetz characterisation [52] of compact metrizable absolute neighbourhood retracts, Pixley considered the following stronger condition. A collection  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of a metric space  $(Y, \rho)$  is called *uniformly equi-(L)* if for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  with the property that for each simplicial complex  $\Sigma$  and subcomplex  $K \subset \Sigma$  with  $\mathbf{V}_\Sigma \subset K$ , each continuous  $g : |K| \rightarrow S$  with  $\text{diam}(g(|K \cap \sigma|)) < \delta$  for every  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ , can be extended to a continuous  $f : |\Sigma| \rightarrow S$  such that  $\text{diam}(f(|\sigma|)) < \varepsilon$ ,  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ . Pixley remarked that each uniformly equi-(L) family is uniformly equi-LAE based on a result of Lefschetz [52, (6.6)] and the extension theorem of Dugundji [21, Theorem 3.1], but the converse is not true due to Theorem 6.7. Thus, he stated implicitly the following question.

**Question 24** ([72]). Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $(Y, \rho)$  be a complete metric space, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\{\Phi(x) : x \in X\}$  is uniformly equi-(L) and each  $\Phi(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , is an AE. Does there exist a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ? What if  $\Phi$  is  $\rho$ -continuous?



**6.3. Selections Avoiding Sets.** For spaces  $S$  and  $Y$ , we use  $C(S, Y)$  to denote the set of all continuous maps from  $S$  to  $Y$  endowed with the compact-open topology. In fact,  $C(S, Y)$  will be used in the case of a compact  $S$  and a metrizable  $Y$ , where this topology is the uniform topology on  $C(S, Y)$  generated by any compatible metric on  $Y$ . Finally, let  $\mathbf{Q} = [0, 1]^\omega$  be the Hilbert cube;  $\mathbf{I}^n = [0, 1]^n$  be the  $n$ -cube, and  $\mathbf{I}^0$  to be the 0-cube (i.e. a singleton).

A closed set  $A$  of a metrizable space  $Y$  is said to be a  $Z_n$ -set in  $Y$ , where  $n \geq 0$ , if  $C(\mathbf{I}^n, Y \setminus A)$  is dense in  $C(\mathbf{I}^n, Y)$ , and  $A$  is called a  $Z$ -set in  $Y$  if  $C(\mathbf{Q}, Y \setminus A)$  is dense in  $C(\mathbf{Q}, Y)$ , see [9] and [93]. The collection of all  $Z_n$ -sets ( $Z$ -sets) in  $Y$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{Z}_n(Y)$  (respectively,  $\mathcal{Z}(Y)$ ). Let us remark that the elements of  $\mathcal{Z}_0(Y)$  are precisely the closed nowhere dense subsets of  $Y$ . Moreover, it is well known that  $\mathcal{Z}(Y) = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{Z}_n(Y)$ , see e.g. [6, Proposition 2.1 in §2 of Chapter V]. In view of this, the  $Z$ -sets are sometimes called  $Z_\infty$ -sets. Finally, let us also remark that a closed subset  $A \subset \mathbf{Q}$  is a  $Z$ -set in  $\mathbf{Q}$  iff the identity map of  $\mathbf{Q}$  can be uniformly approximated by continuous self-maps of  $\mathbf{Q}$  with range entirely contained  $\mathbf{Q} \setminus A$ , see e.g. [62, Lemma 6.2.3].

The following characterisation of  $C$ -spaces was obtained by Uspenskij [96, Theorem 1.4].

**Theorem 6.8** ([96]). *A compact space  $X$  is a  $C$ -space if and only if for every continuous mapping  $\Psi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{Q})$  there exists a continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$  such that  $f(x) \notin \Psi(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ .*

Subsequently, Theorem 6.8 was extended to all paracompact  $C$ -spaces in [43, Theorem 1.1].

**Theorem 6.9** ([43]). *A paracompact space  $X$  is a  $C$ -space if and only if whenever  $E$  is a Banach space,  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  is l.s.c. and  $\Psi_n : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , are closed-graph mappings with  $\Psi_n(x) \cap \Phi(x) \in \mathcal{Z}(\Phi(x))$ , for all  $x \in X$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow E$  with  $f(x) \in \Phi(x) \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi_n(x)$ , for every  $x \in X$ .*

Every continuous mapping  $\Psi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{Q})$  has a closed graph. Hence, by taking  $\Phi(x) = \mathbf{Q}$ ,  $x \in X$ , Theorem 6.8 follows from Theorem 6.9. The interested reader is referred to [97], where finite  $C$ -spaces were characterised in a similar manner; also to [44], where a natural finite-dimensional version of Theorem 6.9 (in terms of  $Z_n$ -sets) was obtained.

**6.4. Selections and Convex  $G_\delta$ -Sets.** If  $Y$  is completely metrizable and an absolute extensor for the metrizable spaces, then it is also an absolute extensor for the collectionwise normal spaces [17]. In particular, this is true for every convex  $G_\delta$ -subset  $Y$  of a Banach space  $E$ . Indeed,  $Y$  is an absolute extensor for the metrizable spaces being convex (by Dugundji's extension theorem [21]),

and is also completely metrizable being a  $G_\delta$ -subset of a complete metric space. Motivated by this, the following problem was stated by Michael in [61, Problem 396], it became known as *Michael's  $G_\delta$ -problem*.

**Question 25** ([61]). Let  $E$  be a Banach space,  $Y \subset E$  be a convex  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $E$ ,  $X$  be a paracompact space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

In general, the answer to this question is in the negative due to a counterexample constructed by Filippov [27, 28], see also [78]. However, Question 25 was also resolved in the affirmative in a number of partial cases. As Michael remarked in [61, Remark 3.11], the answer is “Yes” if  $\overline{\text{conv}(K)} \subset \Phi(x)$  for every compact subset  $K \subset \Phi(x)$  and  $x \in X$ . For instance, this is true if  $Y$  is a countable intersection of open convex sets, or  $\dim \Phi(x) < \infty$ , for all  $x \in X$ . Various related observations for this special case can be found in [29, 68]. Another remark made by Michael is that the answer is “Yes” provided  $\dim(X) < \infty$  [61, Remark 3.6].

All these special cases were generalised in [31, Theorem 1.1] by showing that in the setting of Question 25, continuous selections are equivalent to the existence of convex-valued usco selections (i.e. convex-compact-valued u.s.c. selections).

**Theorem 6.10** ([31]). *For a paracompact space  $X$  and a  $G_\delta$ -subset  $Y$  of a Banach space  $E$ , the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *Every l.s.c.  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  has a continuous selection.*
- (b) *Every l.s.c.  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  has an usco convex-valued selection.*

Furthermore, Theorem 6.10 implies that the answer is “Yes” when  $X$  is a countable-dimensional metrizable space [31, Corollary 1.2], or when it is a strongly countable-dimensional paracompact space [31, Corollary 1.3].

Finally, let us explicitly remark that Question 25 was also resolved in the affirmative in the realm of  $C$ -spaces [43, Theorem 4.4].

**Theorem 6.11** ([43]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact  $C$ -space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $Y$  be a  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $E$ . Then every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  has a continuous selection.*

This result is, in fact, based on Theorem 6.9 and the following property of convex  $G_\delta$ -sets in Banach space, see [43, Lemma 4.3].

**Lemma 6.12** ([43]). *If  $E$  is a Banach space,  $H \subset E$  is a convex  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $E$  and  $F \subset E$  is a closed set with  $F \cap H \in \mathcal{Z}(H)$ , then  $F \cap \overline{H} \in \mathcal{Z}(\overline{H})$ .*

Motivated by this, the following question was posed by Repovš and Semenov in [77, Problem 1.6], and subsequently in [79, Problem 2.6].

**Question 26** ([77, 79]). Let  $X$  be a paracompact space such that for every  $G_\delta$ -subset  $Y \subset E$  of a Banach space  $E$ , every l.s.c.  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  has a continuous selection. Does this imply that  $X$  is a  $C$ -space?

Question 26 was resolved by Karashev [48, Theorem 4.6] for the case of weakly infinite-dimensional compact spaces.

**Theorem 6.13** ([48]). *Let  $X$  be a compact space such that for every  $G_\delta$ -subset  $Y \subset E$  of a Banach space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  has a continuous selection. Then  $X$  is weakly infinite-dimensional.*

As remarked in [79], perhaps what is also interesting is the implicit relation of Theorem 6.13 to one of the main problems in infinite dimension theory of whether every weakly infinite-dimensional compact metric space has property  $C$ . In the realm of compact spaces, there are various characterisations of weak infinite-dimensionality. In case of Theorem 6.13, Karashev used the following property, compare with Theorem 6.8.

**Theorem 6.14** ([81]). *A compact space  $X$  is weakly infinite-dimensional if and only if for every continuous map  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$  in the Hilbert cube  $\mathbf{Q}$ , there exists a continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$  with  $f(x) \neq g(x)$ , for all  $x \in X$ .*

Another aspect of Question 25 was considered in [39]. Namely, in view of the relationship between selections and extension (see Theorem 2.6), the following question was posed in [39, Question 2].

**Question 27** ([39]). Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $Y \subset E$  be a convex  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $E$  and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Does  $\Phi$  have a continuous selection?

This question is not only similar to Question 25, but most of the affirmative solutions of Question 25 remain valid for it as well. Indeed, if  $\overline{\text{conv}(K)} \subset \Phi(x)$  for every compact subset  $K \subset \Phi(x)$  and  $x \in X$ , by a result of [15],  $\Phi$  has an l.s.c. selection  $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_c(Y)$ . Hence,  $\Phi$  also has a continuous selection because, by Theorem 2.3, so does  $\varphi$ . If  $X$  is finite-dimensional, the answer is also “Yes”, and follows directly from a selection theorem in [30]. The answer to Question 27 is also “Yes” if  $X$  is strongly countable-dimensional. In this case, the mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(Y)$  has an l.s.c. weak-factorisation  $(Z, g, \varphi)$  with  $Z$  being a strongly countable-dimensional space, see, for instance, the proof of [69, Theorem 5.3]. Then just as in the proof of Proposition 3.2,  $\Phi$  has a continuous selection because so does the mapping  $\overline{\text{conv}[\varphi]}^Y : Z \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$ , where the closure is in  $Y$ .

In contrast to Theorem 6.11, Question 27 is still open for collectionwise normal  $C$ -spaces.

**Question 28.** Let  $X$  be a collectionwise normal  $C$ -space,  $E$  be a Banach space,  $Y$  be a convex  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $E$  and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}'_c(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Does there exist a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ?

As mentioned before, a countably paracompact normal  $C$ -space is paracompact, in which case the answer is “Yes”, by Theorem 6.11. Hence, Question 28 is for collectionwise normal spaces which are not countably paracompact.

Every countable-dimensional metrizable space has property  $C$ , and more generally, every countable-dimensional hereditarily paracompact space is a  $C$ -space [1, Corollary 2.10]. However, it seems it is still an open question if every countable-dimensional paracompact space is a  $C$ -space [26, Question 1]. This brings the following related question in terms of selections and  $G_\delta$ -sets of Banach spaces.

**Question 29.** Let  $X$  be a countable-dimensional paracompact space,  $Y \subset E$  be a (convex)  $G_\delta$ -subset of a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping. Does there exist a continuous selection for  $\Phi$ ?

**6.5. Disjoint Sections and Selections.** There is a further relationship between  $C$ -spaces and the property of weakly infinite-dimensional spaces used by Karashev [48], see Theorem 6.14. A pair of set-valued mappings  $\varphi, \psi : X \rightsquigarrow Y$  are called *disjoint* if  $\varphi(x) \cap \psi(x) = \emptyset$ , for every  $x \in X$ . It was shown by Dranishnikov [20, Theorem 1], see also [19], that the fibration

$$\eta = \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} \nu_{2^i} : \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{S}^{(2^i)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^{(2^i)}$$

does not accept two disjoint usco sections, where  $\nu_k : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^k$  is a 2-fold covering map of the  $k$ -sphere onto the real projective  $k$ -space. Here, an usco section for  $\eta$  is meant an usco set-valued selection for the inverse set-valued mapping  $\eta^{-1}$ . Since  $\eta$  is open, its inverse is l.s.c., so this is an example of an l.s.c. infinite-valued mapping which doesn't admit a pair of disjoint usco selections. On the other hand, the following was shown in [45, Corollary 4.4].

**Theorem 6.15** ([45]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact  $C$ -space,  $Y$  be completely metrizable and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(Y)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that each  $\Phi(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , is infinite. Then  $\Phi$  has a pair of disjoint usco selections.*

Regarding disjoint usco selections, the following part of [49, Problem 1516] is still open.

**Question 30** ([49]). Let  $X$  be a metrizable space such that for every metrizable space  $Y$ , any l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(Y)$  with perfect point-images  $\Phi(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , admits disjoint u.s.c. selections. Is it true that  $X$  is a  $C$ -space?

A map  $f : X \rightarrow E$  is said to *avoid* some set  $Z \subset E$ , if  $f(x) \notin Z$  for all  $x \in X$ . In case  $E$  is a linear space and  $Z = \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is the singleton of the origin of  $E$ , the

map is simply called **0-avoiding**. In [60], Michael considered the following natural problem for **0-avoiding** selections.

**Question 31** ([60]). Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\Phi(x) \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , for every  $x \in X$ . Under what conditions, does  $\Phi$  have a continuous **0-avoiding** selection?

He remarked that in setting of selection theorems such as Theorem 2.4, the constructed continuous selections cannot be chosen to be **0-avoiding** (even when  $\Phi(x) \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$  for all  $x \in X$ ), and provided several examples, see [60, Examples 10.1 and 10.2]. In case of dimension restrictions on  $X$ , or strengthening the continuity of  $\Phi$ , he obtained the following theorems.

**Theorem 6.16** ([60]). *Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping such that  $\dim(X) < \dim \Phi(x)$ , whenever  $x \in X$  and  $\mathbf{0} \in \Phi(x)$ . Then  $\Phi$  has a continuous **0-avoiding** selection.*

**Theorem 6.17** ([60]). *Let  $X$  be an arbitrary space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be a norm-continuous mapping with  $\dim \Phi(x) = \infty$ , for all  $x \in X$ . If  $\frac{u}{\|u\|} \in \Phi(x)$ , whenever  $\mathbf{0} \neq u \in \Phi(x)$  and  $x \in X$ , then  $\Phi$  has a continuous **0-avoiding** selection.*

Regarding the proper place of Theorem 6.17, Michael stated the following question in [61, Problem 395].

**Question 32** ([61]). Let  $X$  be a paracompact space,  $E$  be an infinite-dimensional Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping with each  $\Phi(x)$  a linear subspace of deficiency one (or of finite deficiency) in  $E$ . Must  $\Phi$  have a continuous **0-avoiding** selection?

According to [61, Remark 3.7], the answer to this question is “No” if it is only assumed that each  $\Phi(x)$  is infinite-dimensional. This follows from the mentioned example of Dranishnikov [19] and a similar example of Toruńczyk and West [94]. Here are some further remarks regarding Question 32.

**Corollary 6.18.** *Let  $X$  be a paracompact  $C$ -space,  $E$  be a Banach space and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  be an l.s.c. mapping with  $\dim \Phi(x) = \infty$ , for every  $x \in X$ . Then  $\Phi$  has a continuous **0-avoiding** selection.*

*Proof.* Whenever  $x \in X$ , the singleton  $\{\mathbf{0}\}$  is a  $Z$ -set in  $\Phi(x)$  because  $\Phi(x)$  is infinite-dimensional; equivalently,  $\{\mathbf{0}\}$  a  $Z_n$ -set in  $\Phi(x)$  for every  $n \geq 0$  (for instance, one can apply Theorem 6.16 and the definition of a  $Z_n$ -set). Then the existence of a continuous **0-avoiding** selection for  $\Phi$  follows from Theorem 6.9 by taking  $\Psi_n(x) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

As Michael emphasised in [60], the benefit of Theorems 6.16 and 6.17 is that they actually show the existence of continuous selections avoiding given continuous

maps. Namely, suppose that  $g : X \rightarrow E$  is a continuous map in a Banach space, and  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  is an l.s.c. mapping. Then one can consider the l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi - g : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$ , defined by  $[\Phi - g](x) = \Phi(x) - g(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ . If  $\Phi - g$  has a continuous  $\mathbf{0}$ -avoiding selection  $f : X \rightarrow E$ , then  $h = f + g : X \rightarrow E$  is a continuous selection for  $\Phi$  with  $h(x) \neq g(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . Based on this and the characterisation of weakly infinite-dimensional compact spaces in Theorem 6.14, we also have the following observation.

**Proposition 6.19.** *Let  $X$  be a compact space such that for every (separable) Banach space  $E$ , every l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  with  $\dim \Phi(x) = \infty$ , for all  $x \in X$ , has a continuous  $\mathbf{0}$ -avoiding selection. Then  $X$  is weakly infinite-dimensional.*

*Proof.* Consider the Hilbert cube  $\mathbf{Q}$  as a compact convex subset of  $E = \ell_2 = \ell_2(\mathbb{N})$ , or, alternatively, of  $\ell_1 = \ell_1(\mathbb{N})$ . Take a continuous map  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ , and next define an l.s.c. mapping  $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_c(E)$  by  $\Phi(x) = \mathbf{Q} - g(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , see [60, Example 10.2]. Then  $\dim \Phi(x) = \infty$ , for all  $x \in X$ , and by condition,  $\Phi$  has a continuous  $\mathbf{0}$ -avoiding selection  $h : X \rightarrow E$ . As discussed above, this implies that  $f = h + g : X \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$  is a continuous map with  $f(x) \neq g(x)$ , for every  $x \in X$ . According to Theorem 6.14,  $X$  is weakly infinite-dimensional.  $\square$

**Acknowledgement.** The author is very much indebted to the referee who contributed an alternative proof of Theorem 4.2, and whose helpful and essential corrections greatly improved the final version of this paper.

## References

- [1] D. Addis and J. Gresham, *A class of infinite-dimensional spaces. I. Dimension theory and Alexandroff's problem*, Fund. Math. **101** (1978), no. 3, 195–205.
- [2] S. M. Ageev and D. Repovsh, *A unified finite-dimensional selection theorem*, Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. **39** (1998), no. 5, 971–981, i, (in Russian); English translation in Siberian Math. J. **39** (1998), no. 5, 835–843.
- [3] R. A. Aló and L. I. Sennott, *Extending linear space-valued functions*, Math. Ann. **191** (1971), 79–86.
- [4] R. Arens, *Extension of coverings, of pseudometrics, and linear-space-valued mappings*, Canad. J. Math. **5** (1953), 211–215.
- [5] J.-P. Aubin and H. Frankowska, *Set-Valued Analysis*, System & Control, Foundation and Applications, vol. 2, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1990.
- [6] C. Bessaga and A. Pełczyński, *Selected topics in infinite-dimensional topology*, PWN, Warsaw, 1975.
- [7] R. H. Bing, *Metrization of topological spaces*, Canad. J. Math. **3** (1951), 175–186.
- [8] K. Borsuk, *Sur les prolongements des transformations continues*, Fund. Math. **28** (1936), 99–110.
- [9] A. Chigogidze, *Inverse Spectra*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1996.
- [10] A. Chigogidze and V. Valov, *Extensional dimension and  $C$ -spaces*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **34** (2002), no. 6, 708–716.

- [11] M. Choban, *Many-valued mappings and Borel sets*, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč. **22** (1970), 229–250, (in Russian); English translation in Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **22** (1970), 258–280.
- [12] ———, *Many-valued mappings and Borel sets. II*, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč. **23** (1970), 277–301, (in Russian); English translation in Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **23** (1970), 286–310.
- [13] M. Choban and S. Nedev, *Factorization theorems for set-valued mappings, set-valued selections and topological dimension*, Math. Balkanica **4** (1974), 457–460, (in Russian).
- [14] ———, *Continuous selections for mappings with generalized ordered domain*, Math. Balkanica (N.S.) **11** (1997), no. 1-2, 87–95.
- [15] M. Choban and V. Valov, *On a theorem of E. Michael on selections*, C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. **28** (1975), 871–873, (in Russian).
- [16] C. H. Dowker, *On countably paracompact spaces*, Canad. J. of Math. **3** (1951), 291–224.
- [17] ———, *On a theorem of Hanner*, Ark. Mat. **2** (1952), 307–313.
- [18] ———, *Local dimension of normal spaces*, Quart. J. of Math. Oxford **6** (1955), 101–120.
- [19] A. Dranishnikov, *Q-bundles without disjoint sections*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **22** (1988), no. 2, 79–80, (in Russian); English translation in Funct. Anal. Appl. **22** (1988), no. 2, 151–152.
- [20] ———, *A fibration that does not accept two disjoint many-valued sections*, Topology Appl. **35** (1990), 71–73.
- [21] J. Dugundji, *An extension of Tietze’s theorem*, Pacific J. Math. **1** (1951), 353–367.
- [22] J. Dugundji and E. Michael, *On local and uniformly local topological properties*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **7** (1956), 304–307.
- [23] J. Dydak, *Extension theory: the interface between set-theoretic and algebraic topology*, Topology Appl. **74** (1996), no. 1-3, 225–258.
- [24] R. Engelking, *General topology, revised and completed edition*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [25] R. Engelking, R. W. Heath, and E. Michael, *Topological well-ordering and continuous selections*, Invent. Math. **6** (1968), 150–158.
- [26] V. V. Fedorchuk, *Weakly infinite-dimensional spaces*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **62** (2007), no. 2(374), 109–164 (in Russian); English translation in Russian Math. Surveys **62** (2007), no. 2, 323–374.
- [27] V. V. Filippov, *On a question of E. A. Michael*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **45** (2004), no. 4, 735–737.
- [28] ———, *On a problem of E. Michael*, Mat. Zametki **78** (2005), no. 4, 638–640, (in Russian); English translation in Math. Notes **78** (2005), no. 3-4, 597–599.
- [29] V. L. Geints and V. V. Filippov, *On convex hulls of compact sets of probability measures with countable supports*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **45** (2011), no. 1, 83–88, (in Russian); English translation in Funct. Anal. Appl. **45** (2011), no. 1, 69–72.
- [30] V. Gutev, *Continuous selections and finite-dimensional sets in collectionwise normal spaces*, C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. **39** (1986), no. 5, 9–12.
- [31] ———, *Continuous selections,  $G_\delta$ -subsets of Banach spaces and usco mappings*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **35** (1994), no. 3, 533–538.
- [32] ———, *Factorizations of set-valued mappings with separable range*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **37** (1996), no. 4, 809–814.
- [33] ———, *Extending of homotopies via selections and extending of selections via homotopies*, Proceedings of the Eighth Prague Topological Symposium (1996), Topol. Atlas, North Bay, ON, 1997, pp. 128–148 (electronic).
- [34] ———, *An exponential mapping over set-valued mappings*, Houston J. Math. **26** (2000), no. 4, 721–739.

- [35] ———, *Weak factorizations of continuous set-valued mappings*, Topology Appl. **102** (2000), 33–51.
- [36] ———, *Extending of selections via homotopies*, JP J. Geom. Topol. **2** (2002), no. 2, 117–140.
- [37] ———, *Selections and approximations in finite-dimensional spaces*, Topology Appl. **146–147** (2005), 353–383.
- [38] ———, *Open relations and collectionwise normality*, Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math. **65** (2017), no. 1, 69–79.
- [39] V. Gutev and N. R. Loufouma Makala, *Selections, extensions and collectionwise normality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **368** (2010), no. 2, 573–577.
- [40] V. Gutev and S. Nedev, *Continuous selections and reflexive Banach spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129** (2001), no. 6, 1853–1860.
- [41] V. Gutev, H. Ohta, and K. Yamazaki, *Selections and sandwich-like properties via semi-continuous Banach-valued functions*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **55** (2003), no. 2, 499–521.
- [42] ———, *Extensions by means of expansions and selections*, Set-Valued Analysis **11** (2006), 69–104.
- [43] V. Gutev and V. Valov, *Continuous selections and  $C$ -spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), 233–242.
- [44] ———, *Dense families of selections and finite-dimensional spaces*, Set-Valued Analysis **11** (2003), 373–391.
- [45] ———, *Open maps having the Bula property*, Fund. Math. **205** (2009), no. 2, 91–104.
- [46] W. Haver, *A covering property for metric spaces*, Topology Conference (Virginia Polytech. Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg, Va., 1973), Springer, Berlin, 1974, pp. 108–113. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 375.
- [47] T. Kandô, *Characterization of topological spaces by some continuous functions*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **6** (1954), 45–54.
- [48] A. Karashev, *Michael’s problem and weakly infinite-dimensional spaces*, Topology Appl. **155** (2008), 1694–1698.
- [49] A. Karashev, M. Tuncali, and V. Valov, *Topology in North Bay: Some Problems in Continuum Theory, Dimension Theory and Selections*, Open Problems in Topology 2 (E. Pearl, ed.), Elsevier BV., Amsterdam, 2007, pp. 697–710.
- [50] M. Katětov, *On real-valued functions in topological spaces*, Fund. Math. **38** (1951), 85–91.
- [51] ———, *Correction to “On real-valued functions in topological spaces” (Fund. Math. 38 (1951), pp. 85–91)*, Fund. Math. **40** (1953), 203–205.
- [52] S. Lefschetz, *Topics in Topology*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 10, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1942.
- [53] E. Michael, *Point-finite and locally finite coverings*, Canad. J. Math. **7** (1955), 275–279.
- [54] ———, *Continuous selections I*, Ann. of Math. **63** (1956), 361–382.
- [55] ———, *Continuous selections II*, Ann. of Math. **64** (1956), 562–580.
- [56] ———, *Continuous selections III*, Ann. of Math. **65** (1957), 375–390.
- [57] ———, *A theorem on semi-continuous set-valued functions*, Duke Math. J **26** (1959), 647–651.
- [58] ———, *Uniform AR’s and ANR’s*, Compositio Math. **39** (1979), no. 2, 129–139.
- [59] ———, *Continuous selections and finite-dimensional sets*, Pacific J. Math. **87** (1980), 189–197.
- [60] ———, *Continuous selections avoiding a set*, Topology Appl. **28** (1988), 195–213.
- [61] ———, *Some problems*, Open Problems in Topology (J. van Mill and G. M. Reed, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 273–278.



- [62] J. v. Mill, *Infinite Dimensional Topology*, Prerequisites and Introduction, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.
- [63] K. Morita, *Star-finite coverings and star-finite property*, Math. Japonicae **1** (1948), 60–68.
- [64] ———, *Paracompactness and product spaces*, Fund. Math. **50** (1961/1962), 223–236.
- [65] ———, *Products of normal spaces with metric spaces*, Math. Ann. **154** (1964), 365–382.
- [66] ———, *Čech cohomology and covering dimension for topological spaces*, Fund. Math. **87** (1975), no. 1, 31–52.
- [67] J. Nagata, *On the countable sum of zero-dimensional metric spaces*, Fund. Math. **48** (1959/1960), 1–14.
- [68] I. Namioka and E. Michael, *A note on convex  $G_\delta$ -subsets of Banach spaces*, Topology Appl. **155** (2008), no. 8, 858–860.
- [69] S. Nedev, *Selection and factorization theorems for set-valued mappings*, Serdica **6** (1980), 291–317.
- [70] ———, *A selection example*, C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. **40** (1987), no. 11, 13–14.
- [71] S. Nedev and V. Valov, *Normal selectors for the normal spaces*, C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. **37** (1984), no. 7, 843–846.
- [72] C. P. Pixley, *An example concerning continuous selections of infinite-dimensional spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **43** (1974), 237–244.
- [73] R. Pol, *A weakly infinite-dimensional compactum which is not countable-dimensional*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **82** (1981), no. 4, 634–636.
- [74] T. Przymusiński, *Collectionwise normality and absolute retracts*, Fund. Math. **98** (1978), 61–73.
- [75] ———, *Collectionwise normality and extensions of continuous functions*, Fund. Math. **98** (1978), 75–81.
- [76] T. C. Przymusiński and M. L. Wage, *Collectionwise normality and extensions of locally finite coverings*, Fund. Math. **109** (1980), no. 3, 175–187.
- [77] D. Repovš and P. V. Semenov, *Continuous selections of multivalued mappings*, Recent Progress in General Topology, II, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002, pp. 423–461.
- [78] ———, *On closedness assumptions in selection theorems*, Topology Appl. **154** (2007), no. 10, 2185–2195.
- [79] ———, *Continuous selections of multivalued mappings*, Recent Progress in General Topology, III, Atlantis Press, Paris, 2014, pp. 711–749.
- [80] V. Šedivá, *On collectionwise normal and hypocompact space*, Czechoslovak Math. J. **9** (84) (1959), 50–62, (in Russian).
- [81] J. Segal and T. Watanabe, *Universal maps and infinite-dimensional spaces*, Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math. **39** (1991), no. 3-4, 225–228.
- [82] H. L. Shapiro, *Extensions of pseudometrics*, Canad. J. Math. **18** (1966), 981–998.
- [83] I. Shishkov, *Selections of lower semi-continuous mappings into Hilbert spaces*, C. R. Acad. Bulgare Sci. **53** (2000), no. 7, 5–8.
- [84] ———,  *$\Sigma$ -products and selections of set-valued mappings*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **42** (2001), no. 1, 203–207.
- [85] ———, *On a conjecture of Choban, Gutev and Nedev*, Math. Balkanica (N.S.) **18** (2004), no. 1-2, 193–196.
- [86] ———, *Selections of set-valued mappings with hereditarily collectionwise normal domain*, Topology Appl. **142** (2004), no. 1-3, 95–100.
- [87] ———,  *$c$ -paracompactness and selections*, Math. Balkanica (N.S.) **21** (2007), no. 1-2, 51–57.
- [88] ———, *Collectionwise normality and selections into Hilbert spaces*, Topology Appl. **155** (2008), no. 8, 889–897.

- [89] J. C. Smith, *Properties of expandable spaces*, General Topology and its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra, III (Proc. Third Prague Topological Sympos., 1971), Academia, Prague, 1972, pp. 405–410.
- [90] ———, *Collectionwise normality and expandability in quasi- $k$ -spaces*, Topology, Vol. II (Proc. Fourth Colloq., Budapest, 1978), Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, vol. 23, North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1980, pp. 1111–1125.
- [91] H. Tong, *Some characterizations of normal and perfectly normal spaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **54** (1948), no. 1, 65.
- [92] ———, *Some characterizations of normal and perfectly normal spaces*, Duke Math. J. **19** (1952), 289–292.
- [93] H. Toruńczyk, *Concerning locally homotopy negligible sets and characterization of  $l_2$ -manifolds*, Fund. Math. **101** (1978), 93–110.
- [94] H. Toruńczyk and J. West, *Fibrations and bundles with Hilbert cube manifold fibers*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **80** (1989), no. 406, iv+75.
- [95] S. L. Troyanski, *On locally uniformly convex and differentiable norms in certain non-separable Banach spaces*, Studia Math. **37** (1971), 173–180.
- [96] V. Uspenskij, *A selection theorem for  $C$ -spaces*, Topology Appl. **85** (1998), 351–374.
- [97] V. Valov, *Continuous selections and finite  $C$ -spaces*, Set-Valued Analysis **10** (2002), no. 1, 37–51.
- [98] V. Šmulian, *On the principle of inclusion in the space of the type (B)*, Rec. Math. [Mat. Sbornik] N.S. **5(47)** (1939), 317–328, (in Russian).
- [99] B. R. Wenner, *Finite-dimensional properties of infinite-dimensional spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **42** (1972), 267–276.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF MALTA, MSIDA  
MSD 2080, MALTA

*E-mail address:* valentin.gutev@um.edu.mt