

ON THE BEST COAPPROXIMATION PROBLEM IN ℓ_1^n

DEBMALYA SAIN, SHAMIM SOHEL, SOUVIK GHOSH AND KALLOL PAUL

ABSTRACT. We study the best coapproximation problem in the Banach space ℓ_1^n , by using Birkhoff-James orthogonality techniques. Given a subspace \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n , we completely identify the elements x in ℓ_1^n , for which best coapproximations to x out of \mathbb{Y} exist. The methods developed in this article are computationally effective and it allows us to present an algorithmic approach to the concerned problem. We also identify the coproximal subspaces and co-Chebyshev subspaces of ℓ_1^n .

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of *best coapproximation* in Banach space has been introduced by Franchetti and Furi in [2]. Thereafter, this complementary notion of the best approximation has been studied by many mathematicians [2, 5, 6, 7]. Finding the best coapproximation in Banach spaces is known to be a difficult problem especially from the computational point of view. Very recently some progress has been made in [9], where the problem was completely characterized in *the space of diagonal matrices* and in the same article the authors solved the best coapproximation problem computationally in the subspaces of ℓ_∞^n . An interesting natural choice for further study in this direction is to consider the best coapproximation problem in the subspaces of the dual space ℓ_1^n . It is known [4, 6] that given a subspace \mathbb{Y} of a Banach space \mathbb{X} and an element $x \notin \mathbb{Y}$, y_0 is a best coapproximation to x out of \mathbb{Y} if and only if there exists a norm one projection from $\text{span}\{x, \mathbb{Y}\}$ to \mathbb{Y} . On the other hand, a little checking on part of the reader should suffice to convince that the above mentioned theoretical characterization is not particularly effective in explicitly finding the best coapproximation(s), if it exist. Our main aim in this article is to deal with the best coapproximation problem in ℓ_1^n from a computational point of view and to solve the problem explicitly. We completely identify the subspaces of ℓ_1^n which are coproximal and co-Chebyshev. It is time to mention the basic terminologies and the notations to be used throughout the article.

We use the symbols \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} to denote real Banach spaces, unless stated otherwise. Let θ denote the zero vector of any Banach space, other than the scalar field. The usual notations $B_{\mathbb{X}} = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : \|x\| \leq 1\}$ and $S_{\mathbb{X}} = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : \|x\| = 1\}$ are used to denote the unit ball and the unit sphere of \mathbb{X} , respectively. An element

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46B20, Secondary 47L05.

Key words and phrases. best coapproximations; coproximal subspace; co-Chebyshev subspace; Birkhoff-James orthogonality; dual space.

The research of Dr. Debmalya Sain is supported by grant PID2021-122126NB-C31 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by ‘‘ERDF A way of making Europe’’ under the mentorship of Professor Miguel Martın. The second and third author would like to thank CSIR, Govt. of India, for the financial support in the form of Junior Research Fellowship under the mentorship of Prof. Kallol Paul.

$x \in B_{\mathbb{X}}$ is said to be an extreme point of the unit ball if $x = (1-t)y + tz$, for some $t \in (0, 1)$ and for some $y, z \in B_{\mathbb{X}}$, then $x = y = z$. The collection of all extreme points of the unit ball $B_{\mathbb{X}}$ is denoted by $Ext(B_{\mathbb{X}})$. The dual of a Banach space \mathbb{X} is denoted by \mathbb{X}^* . Given any $f \in \mathbb{X}^*$, M_f denotes the norm attainment set of f , i.e., $M_f := \{x \in S_{\mathbb{X}} : |f(x)| = \|f\|\}$. We note that $M_f \neq \emptyset$, whenever \mathbb{X} is reflexive. Given any $m \times n$ matrix A , A^t denotes the transpose of A . Let $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y})$ be denoted as the Banach space of all bounded linear operators from \mathbb{X} to \mathbb{Y} , endowed with the usual operator norm. For given any $T \in \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y})$, the kernel of T , denoted by $ker T$, is defined as $ker T := \{x \in \mathbb{X} : Tx = \theta \in \mathbb{Y}\}$. Accordingly, the kernel of $f \in \mathbb{X}^*$ is denoted by $ker f$, i.e., $ker f = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : f(x) = 0\}$. Let us now recall the following definition of best coapproximation which is of fundamental importance in our context.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathbb{X} be a Banach space and let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of \mathbb{X} . Given any $x \in \mathbb{X}$, we say that $y_0 \in \mathbb{Y}$ is a best coapproximation to x out of \mathbb{Y} if $\|y_0 - y\| \leq \|x - y\|$ for all $y \in \mathbb{Y}$.

In a Banach space (even in the finite-dimensional case), neither the existence nor the uniqueness of best coapproximation(s) is guaranteed. A subspace \mathbb{Y} of the Banach space \mathbb{X} is said to be coproximal if a best coapproximation to any element of \mathbb{X} out of \mathbb{Y} exists. A coproximal subspace \mathbb{Y} is said to be co-Chebyshev if the best coapproximation is unique in each case. Given $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and a subspace \mathbb{Y} of \mathbb{X} , we denote by $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}}(x)$ the set of all best coapproximations to x out of \mathbb{Y} . We also define $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}})$ as the collection of all such $x \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}}(x) \neq \emptyset$.

The study of best coapproximation has an immediate connection to *the concept of Birkhoff-James orthogonality*. Following the pioneering articles [1, 3], given any two elements x, y in a Banach space \mathbb{X} , we say that x is *Birkhoff-James orthogonal to y* , written as $x \perp_B y$, if $\|x + \lambda y\| \geq \|x\|$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. The said connection can be stated (and verified in a rather straightforward manner) in terms of Birkhoff-James orthogonality as follows: Given a subspace \mathbb{Y} of a Banach space \mathbb{X} and an element $x \in \mathbb{X}$, $y_0 \in \mathbb{Y}$ is a best coapproximation to x out of \mathbb{Y} if and only if $\mathbb{Y} \perp_B (x - y_0)$ i.e., $y \perp_B (x - y_0)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{Y}$. In this article, our main objective is to completely solve the problem of finding the best coapproximation(s) to a given element in ℓ_1^n out of a given subspace \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n , provided the best coapproximation(s) exist. As mentioned before, it is known that given a subspace \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n and $x \notin \mathbb{Y}$, y_0 is a best coapproximation to x out of \mathbb{Y} if and only if there exists a norm one projection from $span\{x, \mathbb{Y}\}$ to \mathbb{Y} . However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no method available to explicitly find these norm one projections. We present a computationally effective solution to this problem, resulting in an algorithmic approach to the best coapproximation problem in ℓ_1^n . It also allows us to discuss the existence of best coapproximations in the said setting. We also completely identify the coproximal and co-Chebyshev subspaces of ℓ_1^n .

2. MAIN RESULTS

We first introduce the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a set of linearly independent elements in ℓ_1^n , where $\tilde{a}_k = (a_1^k, a_2^k, \dots, a_n^k)$, for each $1 \leq k \leq m$. Considering $\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m$ as column vectors, we form the $n \times m$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m}$, where $a_{ij} = a_i^j$.

- (i) For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, the i -th component of \mathcal{A} is defined as the i -th row of A , i.e., $(a_i^1, a_i^2, \dots, a_i^m)$. Whenever the context is clear, we simply refer to the i -th component of \mathcal{A} as the i -th component.
- (ii) The i -th component and the j -th component are said to be *equivalent* if $(a_i^1, a_i^2, \dots, a_i^m) = c(a_j^1, a_j^2, \dots, a_j^m)$, where $c(\neq 0) \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (iii) The *zero set* $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of \mathcal{A} is defined as

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \left\{ i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : (a_i^1, a_i^2, \dots, a_i^m) = (0, 0, \dots, 0) \right\}.$$

In the following proposition, we show the basis invariance of *the equivalent components and the zero set*.

Proposition 2.2. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\widetilde{a}_1, \widetilde{a}_2, \dots, \widetilde{a}_m\}$, $\mathcal{B} = \{\widetilde{b}_1, \widetilde{b}_2, \dots, \widetilde{b}_m\}$ be two bases of \mathbb{Y} , where $\widetilde{a}_k = (a_1^k, a_2^k, \dots, a_n^k)$ and $\widetilde{b}_k = (b_1^k, b_2^k, \dots, b_n^k)$, for any $1 \leq k \leq m$. Then*

- (i) *the i -th and j -th component of \mathcal{A} are equivalent if and only if the i -th and j -th component of \mathcal{B} are equivalent.*
- (ii) $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Proof. (i) Consider the two matrices A and B as constructed in Definition 2.1. Since \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are two bases of \mathbb{Y} , there exists an invertible matrix $C = (c_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq m}$ such that $B = AC$, where $b_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^m a_{ik}c_{kj}$, for any $1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m$. The j -th components of \mathcal{B} ,

$$(1) \quad (b_j^1, b_j^2, \dots, b_j^m) = \left(\sum_{k=1}^m c_{k1}a_j^k, \sum_{k=1}^m c_{k2}a_j^k, \dots, \sum_{k=1}^m c_{km}a_j^k \right).$$

Suppose that the i -th and the j -th components of \mathcal{A} are equivalent. Then $(a_i^1, a_i^2, \dots, a_i^m) = c(a_j^1, a_j^2, \dots, a_j^m)$, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore,

$$(b_j^1, b_j^2, \dots, b_j^m) = c \left(\sum_{k=1}^m c_{k1}a_i^k, \sum_{k=1}^m c_{k2}a_i^k, \dots, \sum_{k=1}^m c_{km}a_i^k \right) = c(b_i^1, b_i^2, \dots, b_i^m).$$

This implies that the i -th and the j -th components of \mathcal{B} are equivalent. By a similar argument, we can easily obtain the converse result.

- (ii) Follows immediately from equation (1). □

We next obtain a characterization of best coapproximation(s) in finite-dimensional subspaces of the dual of a reflexive Banach space. This simple observation will play an important role in finding the best coapproximation in the subspaces of ℓ_1^n .

Theorem 2.3. *Let \mathbb{X} be a reflexive Banach space and let $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m \in \mathbb{X}^*$ be linearly independent. Given any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k$ is a best coapproximation to $f \in \mathbb{X}^*$ out of $\text{span}\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m\}$ if and only if given any $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k} \cap \ker(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k) \neq \emptyset$$

Proof. It follows from the definitions of Birkhoff-James orthogonality and best coapproximation that $\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k$ is a best coapproximation to f out of $\text{span}\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m\}$ if and only if $g \perp_B (f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k)$, for all $g \in \text{span}\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m\}$. Clearly, this is equivalent to the following:

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k \perp_B (f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k) \forall \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Now applying [8, Th. 3.2], we conclude that the above condition is equivalent to $M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k} \cap \ker(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k) \neq \emptyset$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

In the following section, we focus on subspaces \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n spanned by the basis \mathcal{A} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$.

SECTION-I

We begin this section by noting that there exists a canonical isometric isomorphism ψ between ℓ_1^n and $(\ell_\infty^n)^*$, defined as $\psi(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = g$, where $g : \ell_\infty^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given as : $g(\alpha_1 e_1 + \alpha_2 e_2 + \dots + \alpha_n e_n) = \alpha_1 a_1 + \alpha_2 a_2 + \dots + \alpha_n a_n$, $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$ being the standard ordered basis of \mathbb{R}^n . Thus, given a subspace \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n and an element $x \notin \mathbb{Y}$, the problem of finding best coapproximation to x out of \mathbb{Y} is equivalent to the problem of finding the same to $\psi(x)$ out of the subspace $\psi(\mathbb{Y})$ in $(\ell_\infty^n)^*$. This observation will be used as and when required. We also require the following two definitions.

Definition 2.4. A set S in a Banach space is said to be symmetric if $x \in S$ implies $-x \in S$.

Definition 2.5. Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n . A symmetric set \mathcal{N} is said to be a norming set of \mathbb{Y} if $(M_g \cap \text{Ext}(B_{\ell_\infty^n})) \cap \mathcal{N} \neq \emptyset$, for each $g \in \psi(\mathbb{Y})$. A norming set \mathcal{N} is said to be a minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} if for some norming set \mathcal{M} of \mathbb{Y} , $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{N}$ implies that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}$.

Observe that $M_g \cap \text{Ext}(B_{\ell_\infty^n}) \neq \emptyset$, for each $g \in \psi(\mathbb{Y})$. Clearly, the minimal norming set may not be unique. Let $g \in (\ell_\infty^n)^*$. Then for any $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \ell_\infty^n$, $g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n g(e_i)x_i$. The following result ensures the existence of the minimal norming set of a subspace \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n .

Theorem 2.6. Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. Then there exists a unique minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} .

Proof. Suppose that $\psi(\tilde{a}_i) = g_i$, for any $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$, we observe that

$$\left\{ e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n \right\} \cap \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^m \text{Ker } g_j \right) = \emptyset.$$

Any element g of $\psi(\mathbb{Y})$ is of the form $g = \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k$, where $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Moreover, we note that $g_k(e_i) = a_i^k$, for any $1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq n$. We will prove the theorem in the following four steps.

Step 1 : We express \mathbb{R}^m as the union of finitely many hyperplanes and open sets which are relevant to our purpose. For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we consider the hyperplane H_i of \mathbb{R}^m , given by

$$H_i = \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_i) = 0 \right\}.$$

Assume that H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r are distinct hyperplanes, where $r \leq n$. For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, consider the sets H_i^+ and H_i^- given by

$$H_i^+ = \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_i) > 0 \right\}$$

$$H_i^- = \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_i) < 0 \right\}.$$

Observe that $H_i^+ \cap H_i^- = \emptyset$ and $H_i^+ \cup H_i^- = \mathbb{R}^m$, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$. Consider the set $K_j = H_1^{\delta_{j1}} \cap H_2^{\delta_{j2}} \cap \dots \cap H_r^{\delta_{jr}}$, where $\delta_{ji} \in \{+, -\}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$. It is immediate that there are at most 2^r number of such sets. We assume that $\pm K_1, \pm K_2, \dots, \pm K_q$ are the nonempty such sets. Then

$$\mathbb{R}^m = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^q (K_i \cup -K_i) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^r H_j \right) = K \cup H,$$

where $K = \bigcup_{i=1}^q (K_i \cup -K_i)$ and $H = \bigcup_{j=1}^r H_j$.

Step 2 : We find the norm attaining set of functionals of the form $\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k$, where $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in K$. We first associate each of the nonempty sets $K_s (1 \leq s \leq q)$ with an extreme point of $B_{\ell_\infty^n}$. For any $\tilde{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in K_s$, let us construct $\tilde{x}_s = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in S_{\ell_\infty^n}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= 1, & \tilde{\beta} &\in H_t^+ \\ &= -1, & \tilde{\beta} &\in H_t^-. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\tilde{x}_s \in \text{Ext}(B_{\ell_\infty^n})$. Note that construction of \tilde{x}_s is independent of $\tilde{\beta}$, for if $\tilde{\beta} \in (H_{i_1}^+ \cap H_{i_2}^+ \dots \cap H_{i_s}^+) \cap (H_{j_1}^- \cap H_{j_2}^- \dots \cap H_{j_t}^-)$, where $1 \leq s+t \leq r$, then for any $\tilde{\omega} \in K_s$, we have $\tilde{\omega} \in (H_{i_1}^+ \cap H_{i_2}^+ \dots \cap H_{i_s}^+) \cap (H_{j_1}^- \cap H_{j_2}^- \dots \cap H_{j_t}^-)$. Thus with each K_i we associate an extreme point \tilde{x}_i , where $1 \leq i \leq q$. Let $\mathcal{N} = \{\pm \tilde{x}_1, \pm \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm \tilde{x}_q\}$. We show that $\mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in K} M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k}$. Let $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in K$, then $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in K_s$, for some s . Consider $g = \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k$. Then $g(\tilde{x}_s) = \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_i) x_i > 0$. We show that $M_g = \{\pm \tilde{x}_s\}$. Let $\tilde{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in M_g \cap \text{Ext}(B_{\ell_\infty^n})$.

Therefore, $|g(\tilde{y})| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(\tilde{y}) \right| = \left| \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_1) \right) y_1 + \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_2) \right) y_2 + \dots + \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_n) \right) y_n \right|$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left| \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_1) \right) y_1 + \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_2) \right) y_2 + \dots + \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_n) \right) y_n \right| \\ &= \left| \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_1) \right) \right| + \left| \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_2) \right) \right| + \dots + \left| \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_n) \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is satisfied if and only if each $\left(\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k(e_i) \right) y_i$ have the same sign, which in turn is satisfied if and only if $\tilde{y} = \pm \tilde{x}_s$. Thus $M_g = \{\pm \tilde{x}_s\}$. Therefore, whenever $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) \in K_i$, for some $1 \leq i \leq q$, we have $M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k} = \{\pm \tilde{x}_i\}$. Thus $\mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in K} M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k}$.

Step 3 : We deal with functionals of the form $\sum_{k=1}^m \gamma_k g_k$, where $\tilde{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_m) \in H$. Let us assume that

$$\tilde{\gamma} \in H_{b_1} \cap H_{b_2} \cap \dots \cap H_{b_u} \cap H_{c_1}^+ \cap H_{c_2}^+ \cap \dots \cap H_{c_s}^+ \cap H_{d_1}^- \cap H_{d_2}^- \dots \cap H_{d_t}^-,$$

where $u + s + t = r$.

Let us now consider the set $D_{\tilde{\gamma}} = (\cap_{i=1}^s H_{c_i}^+) \cap (\cap_{i=1}^t H_{d_i}^-)$. Now it is easy to observe that $\tilde{\gamma} \in D_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ and $D_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is an open set of \mathbb{R}^m . Take

$$\tilde{\eta} = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_m) \in D_{\tilde{\gamma}} \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^u H_{b_i}).$$

Then $\sum_{k=1}^m \eta_k g_k(e_l) > 0$, for any $l \in \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_s\}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^m \eta_k g_k(e_l) < 0$, for any $l \in \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_t\}$. It is easy to observe that $\tilde{\eta} \in K_p$, for some $1 \leq p \leq q$. Therefore, $M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \eta_k g_k} = \{\pm \tilde{x}_p = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)\}$ as claimed before. Observe that $x_l = 1$, for any $l \in \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_s\}$ and $x_l = -1$, for all $l \in \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_t\}$. By a straightforward calculation it is easy to observe that $\pm \tilde{x}_p \in M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \gamma_k g_k}$.

Step 4 : We show that \mathcal{N} is the unique minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} . From the previous two steps it follows that \mathcal{N} is a norming set of \mathbb{Y} . Let us consider a symmetric set $\mathcal{M} \subsetneq \mathcal{N}$ and also assume that $\pm \tilde{x}_j \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{M}$. It can be clearly seen that whenever $\tilde{\beta} \in K_j$, $\mathcal{M} \cap M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k} = \emptyset$. This implies that \mathcal{N} is a minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} . From step 2 it follows that \mathcal{N} is the unique minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} . □

We next explore the converse of the previous result.

Theorem 2.7. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} . If the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} is unique then $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let us assume that the minimal norming set \mathcal{N} of \mathbb{Y} is unique. Suppose on the contrary that $j \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$, for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. This implies that $g(e_j) = 0$, for any $g \in \psi(\mathbb{Y})$. Suppose that $\mathcal{N} = \{\pm \tilde{x}_1, \pm \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm \tilde{x}_q\}$ is a minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} , where $\tilde{x}_k = (x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_n^k)$, for $1 \leq k \leq q$. Let us now consider

$$\tilde{y}_1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, \dots, x_{j-1}^1, -x_j^1, x_{j+1}^1, \dots, x_n^1) \in Ext(B_{\ell_\infty^n}).$$

It can be easily observed that for any $g \in \psi(\mathbb{Y})$, $\tilde{y}_1 \in M_g$ if and only if $\tilde{x}_1 \in M_g$. Therefore, $\mathcal{N}_1 = \{\pm \tilde{y}_1, \pm \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm \tilde{x}_q\}$ is a norming set of \mathbb{Y} . Since $\tilde{y}_1 \notin \{\pm \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm \tilde{x}_q\}$, $\mathcal{N}_1 (\neq \mathcal{N})$ is a minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} . This contradicts the assumption that the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} is unique. □

Now we are in a position to present the characterization of the best coapproximation in \mathbb{Y} . This is given in terms of a system of linear equations which clearly illustrates its computational effectiveness.

Theorem 2.8. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. Suppose that $\mathcal{N} = \{\pm \tilde{x}_1, \pm \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm \tilde{x}_q\}$ is the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} , where $\tilde{x}_k = (x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_n^k)$, for any $1 \leq k \leq q$. Then given $\tilde{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \ell_1^n$, $\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{a}_k$ is a best coapproximation to \tilde{b} out of \mathbb{Y} if and only if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following relations:*

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p,$$

for any $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$.

Proof. Suppose that $\psi(\tilde{a}_i) = g_i$, for any $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $\psi(b) = f$. We observe that $\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{a}_k$ being a best coapproximation to \tilde{b} out of \mathbb{Y} is equivalent to $\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k$ being a best coapproximation to f out of $\psi(\mathbb{Y})$.

Let us first prove the necessary part of the theorem. Since $\{\pm \tilde{x}_1, \pm \tilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm \tilde{x}_q\}$ is the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} , it can be easily observed that for any \tilde{x}_s , there exists $\tilde{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k} = \{\pm \tilde{x}_s\}$. It follows from Theorem 2.3 that $M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k} \cap \ker(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $\tilde{x}_s \in \ker(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k)$, i.e., $(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k)\tilde{x}_s = 0$, which implies

$$f(\tilde{x}_s) = \alpha_1 g_1(\tilde{x}_s) + \alpha_2 g_2(\tilde{x}_s) + \dots + \alpha_m g_m(\tilde{x}_s).$$

This is equivalent to

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n g_1(e_i) x_i^s + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n g_2(e_i) x_i^s + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n g_m(e_i) x_i^s = \sum_{i=1}^n f(e_i) x_i^s.$$

Similarly, we can observe that for all $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$,

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n g_1(e_i) x_i^p + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n g_2(e_i) x_i^p + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n g_m(e_i) x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n f(e_i) x_i^p,$$

which implies,

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p,$$

for any $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. This completes the necessary part of the theorem.

We now prove the sufficient part of the theorem. From the hypothesis, we obtain that $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following relations:

$$(2) \quad \alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n g_1(e_i) x_i^t + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n g_2(e_i) x_i^t + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n g_m(e_i) x_i^t = \sum_{i=1}^n f(e_i) x_i^t,$$

for any $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. Now

$$(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k)\tilde{x}_t = f(\tilde{x}_t) - \left\{ \alpha_1 g_1(\tilde{x}_t) + \alpha_2 g_2(\tilde{x}_t) + \dots + \alpha_m g_m(\tilde{x}_t) \right\}.$$

Therefore, using equation (2), it is immediate that $\tilde{x}_t \in \ker(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k)$, for any $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. For any $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$, not all zero, there exists $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ such that $\tilde{x}_s \in M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k}$. Therefore,

$$\tilde{x}_s \in \ker(f - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k g_k) \cap M_{\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k g_k}.$$

Therefore, from Theorem 2.3, the sufficient part of the theorem follows directly. \square

Combining Theorem 2.8 with the theoretical characterization of best coapproximation in terms of norm one projections, as given in [4, 6], we get the following result.

Corollary 2.9. Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\widetilde{a}_1, \widetilde{a}_2, \dots, \widetilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. Suppose that $\mathcal{N} = \{\pm\widetilde{x}_1, \pm\widetilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm\widetilde{x}_q\}$ is the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} , where $\widetilde{x}_k = (x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_n^k)$, for any $1 \leq k \leq q$. Then given $\widetilde{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \ell_1^n$, there exists a norm one projection from $\text{span}\{\widetilde{b}, \mathbb{Y}\}$ to \mathbb{Y} if and only if there exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following relations:

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p,$$

for any $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. Moreover, if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the above system of linear equations then $P(\widetilde{a} + \gamma\widetilde{b}) = \widetilde{a} + \gamma(\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \widetilde{a}_i)$ is the norm 1 projection, for any $\widetilde{a} \in \mathbb{Y}$.

We next obtain an immediate corollary from Theorem 2.8, which guarantees the uniqueness of best coapproximation to a element in ℓ_1^n out of a subspace of ℓ_1^n , provided it exists.

Corollary 2.10. Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\widetilde{a}_1, \widetilde{a}_2, \dots, \widetilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. For any given $f \in \ell_1^n$, if there exists a best coapproximation to f out of \mathbb{Y} then it is unique.

Proof. Let $\{\pm\widetilde{x}_1, \pm\widetilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm\widetilde{x}_q\}$ be the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} , where $\widetilde{x}_k = (x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_n^k)$, for each $1 \leq k \leq q$. Suppose on the contrary, $\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \widetilde{a}_k$ and $\sum_{k=1}^m \gamma_k \widetilde{a}_k$ are two distinct best coapproximations to f out of \mathbb{Y} . Therefore, from Theorem 2.8, $\widetilde{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\widetilde{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\alpha_i \neq \gamma_i$, for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ satisfies the following relations :

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p$$

and

$$\gamma_1 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + \gamma_2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + \gamma_m \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p.$$

for every $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. It is immediate from the above two equations that

$$(\alpha_1 - \gamma_1) \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + (\alpha_2 - \gamma_2) \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + (\alpha_m - \gamma_m) \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = 0,$$

for all $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. Again using Theorem 2.8, we conclude that $\sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha_k - \gamma_k) \widetilde{a}_k$ is a best coapproximation to $\theta \in (\ell_\infty^n)^*$ out of \mathbb{Y} . Therefore, $\alpha_k = \gamma_k$, for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. This contradiction completes the proof. \square

Following Corollary 2.10, it is immediate that any coproximal subspace \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n is also a co-Chebyshev subspace. We are now going to characterize the coproximal(co-Chebyshev) subspaces with the help of Theorem 2.8. We first prove the following proposition.

Proposition 2.11. Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\widetilde{a}_1, \widetilde{a}_2, \dots, \widetilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. Suppose that there are d number of nonequivalent components. Then there exist at most d number of linearly independent elements in the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} .

Proof. Let $\{\pm\widetilde{x}_1, \pm\widetilde{x}_2, \dots, \pm\widetilde{x}_q\}$ be the minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} , where $\widetilde{x}_k = (x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_n^k)$, for each $1 \leq k \leq q$. Let $U = (u_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq q, 1 \leq j \leq n}$ such that $u_{ij} = x_j^i$. If the r -th position and the s -th position are equivalent then from the description of \widetilde{x}_k , defined in the Theorem 2.6 it is easy to observe that $(x_r^1, x_r^2, \dots, x_r^m) = \pm(x_s^1, x_s^2, \dots, x_s^m)$. Therefore, it is easy to observe that $\text{rank}(U) \leq d$. In other words, there exist at most d number of linearly independent elements in the norming set of \mathbb{Y} . \square

Theorem 2.12. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\widetilde{a}_1, \widetilde{a}_2, \dots, \widetilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. Suppose that \mathcal{N} is a minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} and $\dim(\text{span } \mathcal{N}) = q$. Then \mathbb{Y} is a coproximal subspace if and only if $q = m$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{\widetilde{x}_1, \widetilde{x}_2, \dots, \widetilde{x}_q\}$ is a linearly independent set in \mathcal{N} , where $\widetilde{x}_k = (x_1^k, x_2^k, \dots, x_n^k)$, where $1 \leq k \leq q$. Let $T \in \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^q)$ be a linear operator defined by

$$T(\widetilde{\alpha}) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^j x_i^1 \right), \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^j x_i^2 \right), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^j x_i^q \right) \right),$$

where $\widetilde{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Whenever $T(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) = 0$ then it is easy to observe that $\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \widetilde{a}_k$ is the best coapproximation to $\theta \in (\ell_\infty^n)^*$ out of \mathbb{Y} . Clearly, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) = \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and therefore, $\ker T = \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$. In other words, $q \geq m$. To prove the necessary part of the theorem we only need to show $q \leq m$. Let us now take $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_q) \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Then we choose $\widetilde{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \ell_1^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p = u_p$, for any $1 \leq p \leq q$. Since $\{\widetilde{x}_1, \widetilde{x}_2, \dots, \widetilde{x}_q\}$ is linearly independent, the existence of such \widetilde{b} is always guaranteed. As \mathbb{Y} is coproximal, following Theorem 2.8 we obtain that for any $\widetilde{b} \in \ell_1^n$, there exists $\widetilde{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p,$$

for any $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. Therefore, $T(\widetilde{\alpha}) = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_q)$, which implies that T is onto. Consequently, $q \leq m$, establishing the necessary part of the theorem.

Let us now prove the sufficient part of the theorem. Since $q = m$ and $\ker T = \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, it is immediate that T is invertible. This implies that for any $\widetilde{b} \in \ell_1^n$, there exists $\widetilde{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying

$$T(\widetilde{\alpha}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^1, \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^2, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^q \right),$$

which implies

$$\alpha_1 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^1 x_i^p + \alpha_2 \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 x_i^p + \dots + \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^m x_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i^p,$$

for every $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. Since $\{\widetilde{x}_1, \widetilde{x}_2, \dots, \widetilde{x}_q\}$ is a basis of $\text{span } \mathcal{N}$, using Theorem 2.8 we conclude that \mathbb{Y} is a coproximal subspace of ℓ_1^n . \square

We now present an explicit numerical example to illustrate the applicability of Theorem 2.8 towards solving the best coapproximation problem in ℓ_1^n , from a computational point of view.

Example 2.13. Find the best coapproximation(s) to any given $\tilde{b} \in \ell_1^6$ out of the subspace $\mathbb{Y} = \text{span}\{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \tilde{a}_3\}$ of ℓ_1^6 , where $\tilde{a}_1 = (4, 2, 1, -1, -4, 4)$, $\tilde{a}_2 = (-1, 3, 5, 2, 1, 6)$, $\tilde{a}_3 = (1, 4, 2, 1, -1, 8) \in \ell_1^6$.

Step 1: Let $\psi(\tilde{a}_i) = g_i \in (\ell_\infty^n)^*$, where ψ is the canonical isometric isomorphism from ℓ_1^6 to $(\ell_\infty^6)^*$. Here, for any $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_6) \in \ell_\infty^6$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_6) &= 4x_1 + 2x_2 + x_3 - x_4 - 4x_5 + 4x_6, \\ g_2(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_6) &= -x_1 + 3x_2 + 5x_3 + 2x_4 + x_5 + 6x_6, \\ g_3(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_6) &= x_1 + 4x_2 + 2x_3 + x_4 - x_5 + 8x_6. \end{aligned}$$

We first observe that $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \emptyset$. From Theorem 2.6, suppose that \mathcal{N} is the unique minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} .

Step 2: We observe that the 1-st, 2-nd, 3-rd and 4-th positions can be taken as the nonequivalent components. The hyperplanes corresponding to each components are:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 4\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0 \right\}, \\ H_2 &= \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 2\beta_1 + 3\beta_2 + 4\beta_3 = 0 \right\}, \\ H_3 &= \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \beta_1 + 5\beta_2 + 2\beta_3 = 0 \right\}, \\ H_4 &= \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : -\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0 \right\}, \\ H_5 &= \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : -4\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H_6 = \left\{ (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 4\beta_1 + 6\beta_2 + 8\beta_3 = 0 \right\},$$

Clearly, $H_5 = H_1, H_6 = H_2$ and $H_5^+ = H_1^-, H_5^- = H_1^+; H_6^+ = H_2^+, H_6^- = H_2^-$.

Step 3: To solve the best coapproximation problem with the help of Theorem 2.8, we first need to find a basis of $\text{span } \mathcal{N}$. We observe that there are four nonequivalent positions, and therefore, from Proposition 2.11 we note that $\dim(\text{span } \mathcal{N}) \leq 4$.

As mentioned in Theorem 2.6, we consider the sets $K_i = H_1^{\delta_{i1}} \cap H_2^{\delta_{i2}} \cap H_3^{\delta_{i3}} \cap H_4^{\delta_{i4}}$, where $\delta_{ij} \in \{+, -\}$, for any $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Although there are 2^4 number of possible K_i 's, it is evident that we only need to take account of the nonempty K_i 's. Moreover, we associate each of these nonempty K_i 's with an extreme point \tilde{x}_i of $B_{\ell_\infty^6}$, as mentioned in Theorem 2.6.

Suppose that $K_1 = H_1^+ \cap H_2^+ \cap H_3^+ \cap H_4^+$ and it is straightforward to verify that $(1, 2, 3) \in K_1$. Therefore, we obtain $\tilde{x}_1 = (1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 1) \in \text{Ext}(B_{\ell_\infty^6})$.

In a similar manner, we take

$$K_2 = H_1^+ \cap H_2^+ \cap H_3^+ \cap H_4^-, \quad (4, -1, 1) \in K_2.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{x}_2 = (1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1)$. Again

$$K_3 = H_1^+ \cap H_2^+ \cap H_3^- \cap H_4^-, \quad (0, -1, \frac{3}{2}) \in K_3.$$

So, $\widetilde{x}_3 = (1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 1)$. Also take

$$K_4 = H_1^+ \cap H_2^- \cap H_3^- \cap H_4^-, \quad (1, 0, -1) \in K_4.$$

Therefore, we have $\widetilde{x}_4 = (1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1)$.

From Theorem 2.6, it is now immediate that $\widetilde{x}_1, \widetilde{x}_2, \widetilde{x}_3, \widetilde{x}_4 \in \mathcal{N}$. It is straightforward to check that $\{\widetilde{x}_1, \widetilde{x}_2, \widetilde{x}_3, \widetilde{x}_4\}$ is linearly independent. Therefore, $\{\pm(1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 1), \pm(1, 1, 1, -1, -1, 1), \pm(1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 1), \pm(1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1)\}$ is a basis of $\text{span } \mathcal{N}$.

Step 4: In this final step, by considering a given $\widetilde{b} \in \ell_1^6$ and thereafter applying Theorem 2.8, we obtain the best coapproximation to \widetilde{b} out of \mathbb{Y} . In order to illustrate the various possibilities arising in the best coapproximation problem in ℓ_1^6 , it suffices to consider the following two particular cases.

Case 1 : Let $\widetilde{b}_1 = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) \in \ell_1^6$. Then from Theorem 2.8, $\sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i g_i$ is a best coapproximation to \widetilde{b}_1 out of \mathbb{Y} if and only if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} 14\alpha_1 + 14\alpha_2 + 17\alpha_3 &= 11 \\ 16\alpha_1 + 10\alpha_2 + 15\alpha_3 &= 3 \\ 14\alpha_1 + 11\alpha_3 &= -3 \\ 2\alpha_1 - 18\alpha_2 - 13\alpha_3 &= -19. \end{aligned}$$

Since there exist no such $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the above relations, it follows that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}}(\widetilde{b}_1) = \phi.$$

Case 2 : Let $\widetilde{b}_2 = (5, 4, 0, 0, 1, 5) \in \ell_1^6$. Then from Theorem 2.8, $\sum_{i=1}^3 \alpha_i \widetilde{a}_i$ is a best coapproximation to \widetilde{b}_2 out of \mathbb{Y} if and only if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} 14\alpha_1 + 14\alpha_2 + 17\alpha_3 &= 13 \\ 16\alpha_1 + 10\alpha_2 + 15\alpha_3 &= 13 \\ 14\alpha_1 + 11\alpha_3 &= 13 \\ 2\alpha_1 - 18\alpha_2 - 13\alpha_3 &= -5. \end{aligned}$$

Since there exist unique $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the above relations, the best coapproximation to \widetilde{b}_2 out of \mathbb{Y} is unique. Moreover, $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{7}, \alpha_2 = -\frac{3}{7}, \alpha_3 = 1$ and therefore

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}}(\widetilde{b}_2) = \frac{1}{7}\widetilde{a}_1 - \frac{3}{7}\widetilde{a}_2 + \widetilde{a}_3 = (2, 3, 0, 0, -2, 6).$$

We end this section with the following remark.

Remark 2.14. It is already known from [4, 6] that whenever the best coapproximation exists from a element \widetilde{b} to a subspace \mathbb{Y} of ℓ_1^n , then there exist a norm one projection from $\text{span}\{\widetilde{b}, \mathbb{Y}\}$ to \mathbb{Y} . However, it is also natural to look for the explicit description of the concerned projection. In view of the method developed here, we can now find the projection map explicitly. If we consider the subspace \mathbb{Y} and

element \tilde{b}_2 as in Example 2.13, then the norm one projection P from $\text{span}\{\tilde{b}_2, \mathbb{Y}\}$ to \mathbb{Y} is given by:

$$P(\tilde{b}_2) = P(5, 4, 0, 0, 1, 5) = (2, 3, 0, 0, -2, 6); \quad P(y) = y, \forall y \in \mathbb{Y}.$$

In the next section, we deal with subspaces \mathbb{Y} for which the zero set $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$, where \mathcal{A} is a basis of \mathbb{Y} .

SECTION-II

We note that the uniqueness of minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} plays a pivotal role in obtaining the complete characterization of the best coapproximation problem, when the zero set is empty. On the other hand, whenever $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$, the subspace \mathbb{Y} does not possess this property. However, a sufficient condition is clearly possible by choosing a minimal norming set of \mathbb{Y} . We tackle the problem in this section with a different technique, more precisely with the help of the norm of the space ℓ_1^n , to obtain a complete characterization of the problem. The following definitions and notations are needed throughout this section to complete the desired characterization.

Definition 2.15. Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$. Suppose that $|\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}| = r > 0$ and $n - r = k$. Without loss of generality we assume that $\{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

(i) We define a linear transformation ρ from ℓ_1^n to ℓ_1^n by

$$\rho(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n),$$

where $c_i = b_i$, for any $i \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $c_i = 0$, for any $i \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

(ii) We define a linear transformation σ from ℓ_1^n to ℓ_1^k by

$$\sigma(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k).$$

(iii) For a given $\tilde{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \ell_1^n$, we introduce a set $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}} \subset \ell_1^n$, defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}} := \left\{ \tilde{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in \ell_1^n : y_i = b_i \forall j \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} \right\}.$$

We note the following simple but useful properties in the form of a proposition.

Proposition 2.16. Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}} \neq \emptyset$. Suppose that $|\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}| = r > 0$ and $n - r = k$. For any $f \in (\ell_\infty^n)^*$,

- (i) $\rho(\tilde{a}_i) = \tilde{a}_i$ and $\|\rho(\tilde{b})\| \leq \|\tilde{b}\|$.
- (ii) $\|\sigma(\tilde{b})\| \leq \|\tilde{b}\|$ and $\|\sigma(\tilde{a}_i)\| = \|\tilde{a}_i\|$.
- (iii) $\sigma(\rho(\tilde{b})) = \sigma(\tilde{b})$ and $\rho(\rho(\tilde{b})) = \rho(\tilde{b})$.
- (iv) for any $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$, $\rho(\tilde{b}) = \rho(\tilde{y})$.
- (v) $\mathcal{Z}_{\sigma(\mathcal{A})} = \emptyset$, where $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \{\sigma(\tilde{a}_1), \sigma(\tilde{a}_2), \dots, \sigma(\tilde{a}_m)\}$.

In the following theorem, a sufficient condition for the best coapproximation to an element f out of a subspace \mathbb{Y} is given.

Theorem 2.17. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $|\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}| = r > 0$. Then for any $\tilde{b} \in \ell_1^n$, $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i$ is a best coapproximation to \tilde{b} out of \mathbb{Y} if $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i)$ is a best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{b})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$, where $\sigma(\mathbb{Y}) = \text{span}\{\sigma(\tilde{a}_1), \sigma(\tilde{a}_2), \dots, \sigma(\tilde{a}_m)\}$.*

Proof. Since $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i)$ is a best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{b})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$, so for any $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sigma(\tilde{b}) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sigma\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \tilde{b}\right) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \tilde{b} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i$ is a best coapproximation to \tilde{b} out of \mathbb{Y} . This establishes our theorem. \square

Remark 2.18. Observe that the zero set corresponding to a basis of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$ is empty and so following the method discussed in Section I, we can find the best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{b})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$, which in turn allows us to exactly find the best coapproximation to \tilde{b} out of \mathbb{Y} .

In order to characterize the best coapproximation problem in ℓ_1^n , we require the following lemma.

Lemma 2.19. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $|\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}| = r > 0$. Suppose that for $\tilde{b} \in \ell_1^n$, there exists no best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{b})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y}) = \text{span}\{\sigma(\tilde{a}_1), \sigma(\tilde{a}_2), \dots, \sigma(\tilde{a}_m)\}$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $y \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\rho(\tilde{b})) \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$, there exists no best coapproximation to y out of \mathbb{Y} .*

Proof. Since there exists no best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{b})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$, then for any $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, there exists $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) \right\| > \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sigma(\tilde{b}) \right\| = \left\| \sigma\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \tilde{b}\right) \right\|.$$

It is easy to observe that for any $\tilde{u} \in \ell_1^n$, if $\rho(\tilde{u}) = \tilde{u}$ then $\|\sigma(\tilde{u})\| = \|\tilde{u}\|$. Since $\rho\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b})\right) = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b})$, we have

$$\left\| \sigma\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \tilde{b}\right) \right\| = \left\| \sigma\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b})\right) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right\|$$

and therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) \right\| > \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right\|.$$

In other words, there exists no best coapproximation to $\rho(\tilde{b})$ out of \mathbb{Y} . Since for any $\tilde{u} \in \ell_1^n$, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}}(\tilde{u})$ is a compact set [5], it is immediate that $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}})$ is closed. Therefore,

there exists an open ball of radius $\delta > 0$ (say) centered at $\rho(\tilde{b})$, $\mathcal{B}_\delta(\rho(\tilde{b}))$ such that for any $y \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\rho(\tilde{b})) \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$, there exists no best coapproximation to y out of \mathbb{Y} . This proves our lemma. \square

We next characterize the existence of the best coapproximation(s) in ℓ_1^n in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.20. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $|\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}| = r > 0$. Suppose that for $\tilde{b} \in \ell_1^n$, there exists no best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{b})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y}) = \text{span}\{\sigma(\tilde{a}_1), \sigma(\tilde{a}_2), \dots, \sigma(\tilde{a}_m)\}$. Then there exists $\delta_0 (> 0)$ satisfying the following:*

- (i) *for any $y \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$ such that $\|y - \rho(\tilde{b})\| < \delta_0$, there exists no best coapproximation to y out of \mathbb{Y} ,*
- (ii) *for any $y \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$ such that $\|y - \rho(\tilde{b})\| \geq \delta_0$, there exists a best coapproximation to y out of \mathbb{Y} .*

Proof. Let us define the set

$$S := \left\{ \delta \in \mathbb{R} : \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{Y}}(y) = \emptyset \ \forall y \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\rho(\tilde{b})) \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}} \right\}.$$

To prove the theorem, we only need to show that S has an upper bound. From Lemma 2.19, it is assured that $S \neq \emptyset$ and if there exists no best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{b})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$ then there exists no best coapproximation to $\rho(\tilde{b})$ out of \mathbb{Y} . It is easy to observe that for all $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right\| + \|\rho(\tilde{b})\|.$$

Suppose that $\tilde{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$. For any $y \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$, we observe that $\rho(y) = \rho(\tilde{b}) \in \ell_1^n$, i.e., $y_i = b_i$, for any $i \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$. We now choose $y \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$ such that $\|y - \rho(\tilde{b})\| = \|\rho(\tilde{b})\|$ then

$$(3) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right\| + \|\rho(\tilde{b})\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right\| + \|y - \rho(\tilde{b})\|$$

for all $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$. Now we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - y \right\| &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i - y_j \right) \right| \\ &= \sum_{j \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i - y_j \right) \right| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i - y_j \right) \right| \\ &= \sum_{j \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i - b_j \right) \right| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} |y_j| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can easily obtain that

$$(4) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - y \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right\| + \|y - \rho(\tilde{b})\|.$$

From equations (3) and (4) we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - y \right\|.$$

In other words, $\theta = (0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \ell_1^n$ is a best coapproximation to y out of \mathbb{Y} . Take $\gamma > \|\rho(\tilde{b})\|$. Therefore, $y \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma(\rho(\tilde{b})) \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{b}}$ and consequently γ is an upper bound of S . Let $\sup S = \delta_0$. Hence the theorem. \square

In the following theorem we characterize the coproximinal subspace of ℓ_1^n .

Theorem 2.21. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $|\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}| = r > 0$. Let $n - r = k$. Then \mathbb{Y} is a coproximinal subspace of ℓ_1^n if and only if $\sigma(\mathbb{Y}) = \text{span}\{\sigma(\tilde{a}_1), \sigma(\tilde{a}_2), \dots, \sigma(\tilde{a}_m)\}$ is a coproximinal subspace of ℓ_1^k .*

Proof. Let us first prove the necessary part of the theorem. For any $\tilde{w} \in \ell_1^k$, we choose $\tilde{b} \in \ell_1^n$ such that $\sigma(\tilde{b}) = \tilde{w}$. Since \mathbb{Y} is a coproximinal subspace of ℓ_1^n , there exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i$ is a best coapproximation to $\rho(\tilde{b})$ out of \mathbb{Y} . Therefore, for any $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right\|$$

Now $\rho\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b})\right) = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b})$, so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right) \right\| &= \left\| \sigma\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \rho(\tilde{b}) \right) \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sigma(\rho(\tilde{b})) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sigma(\tilde{w}) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \tilde{w} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \tilde{w} \right\|.$$

In other words, $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i)$ is a best coapproximation to \tilde{w} out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$. This establishes the necessary part of the theorem.

To prove the sufficient part, let $\tilde{\eta} \in \ell_1^n$. Since $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$ is a coproximinal subspace, there exist $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i)$ is a best coapproximation to $\sigma(\tilde{\eta})$ out of $\sigma(\mathbb{Y})$. Therefore, for any $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k \tilde{a}_k \right\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sigma(\tilde{a}_i) - \sigma(\tilde{\eta}) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \tilde{\eta} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i$ is a best coapproximation to $\tilde{\eta}$ out of \mathbb{Y} . This completes the theorem. \square

Our final result in this section reads as follows.

Theorem 2.22. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a subspace of ℓ_1^n and let $\mathcal{A} = \{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \dots, \tilde{a}_m\}$ be a basis of \mathbb{Y} with $|\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}| = r > 0$. Then \mathbb{Y} is not a co-Chebyshev subspace of ℓ_1^n .*

Proof. Let $\tilde{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \notin \mathbb{Y}$ be such that $\rho(\tilde{b}) = \theta \in \ell_1^n$, which implies that $b_i = 0$, for any $i \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Now for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\|\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i\| \leq \|\tilde{b}\|$ and for any $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_m \in \mathbb{R}$, it is easy to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| + \|\tilde{b}\|. \end{aligned}$$

We also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \tilde{b} \right\| &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i - b_j \right) \right| \\ &= \sum_{j \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i - b_j \right) \right| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i - b_j \right) \right| \\ &= \sum_{j \notin \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i a_j^i \right| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}} |b_j| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| + \|\tilde{b}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \tilde{a}_i - \tilde{b} \right\|.$$

In other words, for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i\| \leq \|\tilde{b}\|$, $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \tilde{a}_i$ is a best coapproximation to \tilde{b} out of \mathbb{Y} . Therefore, \mathbb{Y} is not a co-Chebyshev subspace of ℓ_1^n . This establishes the theorem. \square

We end this article with examples of both coproximal and not coproximal subspaces for which the zero set is non-empty.

Example 2.23. It can be easily verified by using the methods developed in this article that \mathbb{Y}_1 is a coproximal subspace of ℓ_1^7 , whereas \mathbb{Y}_2 is not, where

$$\mathbb{Y}_1 = \text{span}\{(1, 1, 2, 0, 4, -2, 0), (1, 2, 2, 0, 4, -4, 0)\},$$

$$\mathbb{Y}_2 = \text{span}\{(1, 0, 2, 3, -1, -2, 0), (-1, 0, 1, 0, 1, -1, 0)\}.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbb{Y}_3 = \text{span}\{(1, 1, 2, 4, -2), (1, 2, 2, 4, -4)\}$$

is a co-Chebyshev subspace of ℓ_1^5 , but \mathbb{Y}_1 is not co-Chebyshev.

CONCLUSIONS

The computational difficulty in solving the best coapproximation problem arises essentially from the non-linear nature of the inequalities associated with it. We have illustrated in this article that by applying Birkhoff-James orthogonality techniques, it is possible to reduce the much harder non-linear problem into a system of linear equations (see Theorem 2.8).

We have presented explicit examples to highlight the different possibilities for subspaces of ℓ_1^n , from the perspective of best coapproximation. Indeed, it follows from our observations that the newly introduced “zero set” of a subspace plays a fundamental role in the whole scheme of things (see Example 2.13, Corollary 2.10). We have also explored the relationship between coproximal subspaces and co-Chebyshev subspaces of ℓ_1^n , depending on the zero sets of the concerned subspaces. In particular, it is to be noted that there exists a coproximal subspace of ℓ_1^n , which is not co-Chebyshev (see Example 2.23).

In view of the methods developed here, applications of the concept of orthogonality in solving the best coapproximation problem in Banach spaces seem to be a promising direction of research, resulting in efficient algorithms which are computationally advantageous. We have presented several numerical examples in support of this, in the specific setting of ℓ_1^n spaces. For an analogous approach to the best coapproximation problem in ℓ_∞^n spaces, the readers are referred to the recent article [9]. As a matter of fact, it may be interesting to apply Birkhoff-James orthogonality towards obtaining computationally efficient algorithmic solutions to the said problem, in the setting of other classical Banach spaces, such as the ℓ_p^n spaces, where $1 < p (\neq 2) < \infty$.

Declarations.

The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

REFERENCES

- [1] Birkhoff, G., *Orthogonality in linear metric spaces*, Duke Math. J., **1** (1935), 169–172.
- [2] Franchetti, C., Furi, M., *Some characteristic properties of real Hilbert spaces*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl., **17** (1972), 1045–1048.
- [3] James, R. C., *Orthogonality and linear functionals in normed linear spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **61** (1947), 265–292.
- [4] Lewicki, G., Trombetta, G., *Optimal and one-complemented subspaces*, Monatsh. Math., **153** (2008), 115–132.
- [5] Narang, T. D., *On best coapproximation in normed linear spaces*, Rocky Mountain J. Math., **22** (1992), 265–287.
- [6] Papini, P. L., Singer, I., *Best coapproximation in normed linear spaces*, Mh. Math., **88** (1979), 27–44.
- [7] Rao, G.S., Swaminathan, M., *Best coapproximation and Schauder bases in Banach spaces*, Acta Sci. Math., **54** (1990), 339–354.
- [8] Sain, D., *On best approximations to compact operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **149** (2021), 4273–4286
- [9] Sain, D., Sohel, S., Ghosh, S., Paul, K., *On best coapproximations in subspaces of diagonal matrices*, Linear Multilinear Algebra, DOI:10.1080/03081087.2021.2017835

(Sain) DEPARTAMENTO DE ANALISIS MATEMATICO, UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA, E-18071- GRANADA, SPAIN

Email address: `saindebmalya@gmail.com`

(Sohel) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY, KOLKATA 700032, WEST BENGAL, INDIA

Email address: `shamimsohel11@gmail.com`

(Ghosh) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY, KOLKATA 700032, WEST BENGAL, INDIA

Email address: `sghosh0019@gmail.com`

(Paul) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY, KOLKATA 700032, WEST BENGAL, INDIA

Email address: `kalloldada@gmail.com`