

A CHARACTERIZATION OF THE RADON-NIKODYM PROPERTY

ROBERT DEVILLE AND ÓSCAR MADIEDO

ABSTRACT. It is well known that every bounded below and non increasing sequence in the real line converges. We give a version of this result valid in Banach spaces with the Radon-Nikodym property, thus extending a former result of A. Procházka.

1. INTRODUCTION.

Our purpose is to state an analogue of the fact that every bounded below and non increasing sequence in the real line \mathbb{R} converges in the framework of a Banach space X . This is not clear, even whenever $X = \mathbb{R}^2$. However, we shall see that it is indeed possible in Banach spaces with the Radon-Nikodym property.

Definition 1.1. *Let X be a Banach space. We say that X has the Radon-Nikodym property if, for every non empty closed convex bounded subset C of X and every $\eta > 0$, there exists g in the unit sphere of the dual of X and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\{x \in C; g(x) < c\}$ is non empty and has diameter less than η .*

Every reflexive Banach space has the Radon-Nikodym property, but $L^1([0, 1])$ and $\mathcal{C}(K)$ spaces whenever K is an infinite compact space fail this property. Moreover, if Y is a subspace of a Banach space with the Radon-Nikodym property, then Y has the Radon-Nikodym property. The Radon-Nikodym property can be characterized in many ways, see [1], [2] and [5].

Before stating our main result, we need some notations. If X is a real Banach space, S_X stands for its unit sphere and S_{X^*} for the unit sphere of its dual. For $f \in X^*$ and $r > 0$ we denote $\overline{B}(f, r) = \{g \in X^* : \|f - g\| \leq r\}$ and $B(f, r) = \{g \in X^* : \|f - g\| < r\}$ the closed and open ball centered at f and of radius r respectively. Let us recall that whenever X is a Banach space, $g \in X^*$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $\{g \geq c\}$ the closed half space $\{u \in X; g(u) \geq c\}$ and $\{g < c\}$ the open half space $\{u \in X; g(u) < c\}$. If C is a non empty convex subset of X , the set $C \cap \{g \geq c\}$ is called a closed slice of C and $C \cap \{g < c\}$ an open slice of C . If $x \in X$ and $f \in X^*$, we shall use both notations $y(x)$ and $\langle f, x \rangle$ for the evaluation of f at x .

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a Banach space with the Radon-Nikodym property. Let $f \in S_{X^*}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be fixed. There exists a function $t : X \rightarrow S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon)$ such*

Date: Julio, 2012.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 91A05, 46B20, 46B22;

Key words and phrases. Radon-Nikodym property characterization, point-slice game.

Research supported in part by MICINN Project MTM2009-07848 (Spain). The authors wish to thank the Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux where this research has been carried out. O.Madiedo is also supported by grant BES2010-031192.

that for all sequence (x_n) , if the sequence $(f(x_n) - \varepsilon\|x_n\|)$ is bounded below and if $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sequence (x_n) converges in X .

Remark 1.3. Theorem 1.2 can be reformulated in terms of games. This presentation was introduced in [4], see also [2] and [7]. There are two players A and B who play alternatively. Player A chooses linear functionals $f_n \in S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon)$ and player B chooses x_n in the cone $\{x \in X; f(x) - \varepsilon\|x\| + m \geq 0\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{R}$, with the following rules.

- player B chooses a point x_0 ;
- once B has played x_n , A chooses $f_n \in S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon)$;
- once A has played f_n , B chooses x_{n+1} such that $f_n(x_{n+1} - x_n) \leq 0$.

Player A wins if the sequence (x_n) converges. A winning tactic for player A is a function $t : X \rightarrow S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon)$ such that, if for each n , $f_n = t(x_n)$, then A wins the game. Theorem 1.2 expresses the fact that in spaces with the Radon-Nikodym property, player A has always a winning tactic.

Let us give a particular case of Theorem 1.2. We assume here that $X = \mathbb{R}^2$, which has the Radon-Nikodym property. It is clear that if (x_n, y_n) is a sequence in \mathbb{R}^2 such that (y_n) is non increasing and bounded below, then the sequence (y_n) converges, but in general the sequence (x_n, y_n) does not converge, even if we require that the sequence (x_n, y_n) is included in a cone $C = \{(x, y); y - \varepsilon|x| + m \geq 0\}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{R}$. An obvious consequence of our Theorem is :

Corollary 1.4. *Given $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, there exists a function $\tau : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[$ such that for every sequence $(x_n, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, if the sequence $(y_n - \varepsilon|x_n|)$ is bounded below and if $y_{n+1} - y_n \leq \tau(x_n, y_n)(x_{n+1} - x_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sequence (x_n, y_n) converges.*

Proof. Assume that $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ is endowed with the norm $\|(x, y)\|_1 = |x| + |y|$ and that $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Fix $f \in X^*$ with coordinates $(0, 1)$. Observe first that if $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^2$ has coordinates (x_n, y_n) and if the sequence $(y_n - \varepsilon|x_n|)$ is bounded below, then the sequence $(f(X_n) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\|X_n\|_1)$ is bounded below. Applying Theorem 1.2, there exists $t : X \rightarrow S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon})$ such that if the sequence $(f(X_n) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\|X_n\|)$ is bounded below and $\langle t(X_n), X_{n+1} - X_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sequence (X_n) converges in \mathbb{R}^2 . On the other hand, X^* is \mathbb{R}^2 endowed with the supremum norm. Since $t(x, y) \in S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon)$, we have that the coordinates of $t(x, y)$ are of the form $(-\tau(x, y), 1)$, with $-\varepsilon < \tau(x, y) < \varepsilon$. Finally, the condition $\langle t(X_n), X_{n+1} - X_n \rangle \leq 0$ is equivalent to $y_{n+1} - y_n \leq \tau(X_n)(x_{n+1} - x_n)$. \square

Remark 1.5. The above result is an improvement of the following result of A. Procházka, see [6, Theorem 2.3].

Let X be a Banach space with the Radon-Nikodym property and K be a closed convex bounded subset of X . There exists a function $t : K \rightarrow S_{X^}$ such that for all sequence (x_n) in K , if $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the sequence (x_n) converges in X .*

Theorem 1.2 extends the above result in three manners.

- The tactic t is defined on all the space X .
- The hypothesis that the sequence (x_n) is bounded ($x_n \in K$) is replaced by the weaker hypothesis the sequence $(f(x_n) - \varepsilon\|x_n\|)$ is bounded below, which

means that the sequence (x_n) lies in a cone $\{x; f(x) - \varepsilon\|x\| + m \geq 0\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{R}$.

- The tactic t in our theorem takes its values only in a subset of S_{X^*} of small diameter.

Remark 1.6. Let us notice that Theorem 1.2 is actually a characterization of the Radon-Nikodym property. Indeed, if X fails the Radon-Nikodym property, there exists a non empty convex bounded subset C of X and $\eta > 0$, such that for all $f \in S_{X^*}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, if the slice $C \cap \{f < c\}$ is non empty, then it has diameter greater than 2η . Moreover, we can assume that C is open. Indeed, if $\delta < \eta$, the set $C + B(0, \delta)$ is open and all its slices have diameter greater than $2(\eta - \delta)$. Now let (f_n) be a sequence in S_{X^*} . We construct inductively a sequence (x_n) in C as follows. We choose arbitrarily $x_0 \in C$. Once x_n has been constructed, we note that the slice $C \cap \{f_n < f_n(x_n)\}$ is non empty because $x_n \in C$ and C is open, so this slice has diameter greater than 2η , hence we can choose x_{n+1} in C such that $f_n(x_{n+1} - x_n) < 0$ and $\|x_{n+1} - x_n\| \geq \eta$. Moreover, since $\{f(x) - \varepsilon\|x\|; x \in C\}$ is bounded below, we have in particular that $\{f(x_n) - \varepsilon\|x_n\|; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded below. This clearly contradicts the existence of a function t with the property of Theorem 1.2.

Remark 1.7. Let us notice particular cases of Theorem 1.2 have been obtained in [4] and [2], and used there to give a simple proof of Buchzolich's solution of the Weil gradient problem, and also used in [3] to construct almost classical solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations.

Our paper is organized as follows. The following section is devoted to the proof of two elementary geometrical lemmas. In section 3, we define a mapping t on a given subset of X such that for every sequence (x_n) in this subset satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, the sequence (x_n) is η -Cauchy for some $\eta > 0$. Such a mapping will be called η -tactic. In the following section we prove that every mapping which is near (in some sense) the function t is also an η -tactic. We are thus led to the definition of multi- η -tactic. We then construct, for a given sequence (η_k) tending to 0, a decreasing sequence of multi- η_k -tactics, and we prove finally in the last section Theorem 1.2.

2. SLICES.

The following lemma expresses the fact that if D is a closed convex set of X , possibly unbounded, and if S is a bounded slice defined by $\hat{f} \in S_{X^*}$, then functionals which are in a neighborhood of \hat{f} define slices of D included in S .

Lemma 2.1. *Let D be a closed convex set of X , $\hat{f} \in S_{X^*}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $S = D \cap \{\hat{f} < c\}$ is bounded and that both S and $D \setminus S$ are non empty. Let us denote $M := \max\{\|u\|; u \in S\}$ and $R(x) = \frac{c - \hat{f}(x)}{4M}$. If $x \in S$ and $g \in S_{X^*}$ satisfy $\|g - \hat{f}\| \leq R(x)$, then $(D \setminus S) \cap \{g \leq g(x)\} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. It is clear that $0 < M < +\infty$, so, for $x \in S$, $R(x)$ is well defined and $R(x) > 0$. Let us assume that $(D \setminus S) \cap \{g \leq g(x)\} \neq \emptyset$ and fix $z \in D \setminus S$ such that $g(z) \leq g(x)$. There exists a unique $q \in [0, 1]$ such that, if $y = qx + (1 - q)z$, then $\hat{f}(y) = c$.

Thus y is in the closure of S and $\|y\| \leq M$. On the other hand, by linearity of g , $g(z) \leq g(y) \leq g(x)$. By hypothesis, $g(x) \leq \widehat{f}(x) + R(x)\|x\| \leq \widehat{f}(x) + MR(x)$. Hence

$$\widehat{f}(y) \leq g(y) + \|g - \widehat{f}\|\|y\| \leq g(x) + R(x)M \leq \widehat{f}(x) + 2MR(x) = \frac{\widehat{f}(x) + c}{2} < c$$

Thus $\widehat{f}(y) < c$. This contradiction concludes the proof. \square




Figure 1

If D is a closed convex set of a Banach space X and if $g \in X^*$, we say that g strongly exposes D if $\text{diam}(D \cap \{g < c\})$ tends to 0 as c tends to $\inf\{g(u); u \in D\}$. The following lemma expresses the fact that if D is a closed convex set of a Banach space with the Radon-Nikodym property, and if S is a bounded slice defined by $\widehat{f} \in S_{X^*}$, then there exists functionals in a neighborhood of \widehat{f} that define small slices of D included in S .

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that X has the Radon-Nikodym property. Let $\eta, r > 0$ and D be a closed convex set of X . Let $\widehat{f} \in X^*$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $S = D \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$ is a non empty bounded set. Then, there exists $g \in S_{X^*}$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, if $C = D \cap \{g < d\}$, then*

- (i) $C \neq \emptyset$, $\text{diam } C < \eta$ and $C \subset S$,
- (ii) $\|g - \widehat{f}\| < \min\{r, \inf\{R(u); u \in C\}\}$.

Proof. We first claim that if $\tau > 0$, there exists $g_\tau \in X^*$ such that $\|g_\tau - \widehat{f}\| < \tau$ and g_τ strongly exposes D at some point $x_\tau \in D \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$. Indeed, the set $\overline{S} = D \cap \{\widehat{f} \leq c\}$ is a nonempty closed convex bounded subset of X . Thus, the set $\{g \in X^*; g \text{ strongly exposes } \overline{S}\}$ is dense in X^* (see [1]). For each $\tau > 0$, we select $g_\tau \in X^*$ and $x_\tau \in \overline{S}$ such that $\|\widehat{f} - g_\tau\| \leq \tau$ and g_τ strongly exposes \overline{S} at x_τ . We shall now use the following :

Fact : $R(x_\tau)$ converges to $\sup\{R(u); u \in \overline{S}\} = \sup\{R(u); u \in D\} > 0$ as τ goes to 0.

Since $R(x) = \gamma(c - \widehat{f}(x))$ where γ is a positive constant, it is enough to prove that $\widehat{f}(x_\tau)$ converges to $\inf\{\widehat{f}(x); x \in \overline{S}\}$. If we denote $A = \sup\{\|x\|; x \in \overline{S}\}$, we have

$$\widehat{f}(x_\tau) \leq g_\tau(x_\tau) + A\|g_\tau - \widehat{f}\| \leq \tau A + g_\tau(x)$$

for all $x \in \overline{S}$. Thus

$$\widehat{f}(x_\tau) \leq \tau A + \widehat{f}(x) + \|\widehat{f} - g_\tau\| \cdot \|x\| \leq 2\tau A + \widehat{f}(x)$$

Taking the infimum over all $x \in \overline{S}$, we obtain

$$\inf\{\widehat{f}(x); x \in \overline{S}\} \leq \widehat{f}(x_\tau) \leq 2\tau A + \inf\{\widehat{f}(x); x \in \overline{S}\}$$

and this proves the fact. Since $\sup\{R(u); u \in D\} > 0$, if τ is small enough, we have $R(x_\tau) > 0$, thus g_τ strongly exposes \bar{S} at some point $x_\tau \in D \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$, hence g_τ strongly exposes D at some point $x_\tau \in D \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$, and this proves the claim.

We now prove the lemma. We fix τ such that $\tau \leq \min\{r, \sup\{R(u); u \in D\}/2\}$ and such that $R(x_\tau) > \sup\{R(u); u \in D\}/2$. Let us denote $C_\delta = D \cap \{g_\tau < g_\tau(x_\tau) + \delta\}$. Using the continuity of R and the fact that g_τ strongly exposes D at x_τ , we have that $\inf\{R(u); u \in C_\delta\}$ tends to $R(x_\tau)$. We now fix $\delta > 0$ small enough so that $\inf\{R(u); u \in C_\delta\} > \sup\{R(u); u \in D\}/2$ and $\text{diam}(C_\delta) < \eta$. We now put $g = g_\tau$ and $d = g_\tau(x_\tau) + \delta$. The set $C = C_\delta = D \cap \{g < d\}$ is non empty and $\text{diam}(C) < \eta$. Since $\inf\{R(u); u \in C\} > 0$, we have that $C \subset S$. Finally, $\|g - \widehat{f}\| < \tau \leq \min\{r, \sup\{R(u); u \in D\}/2\} \leq \min\{r, \inf\{R(u); u \in C\}\}$. \square

3. ε -TACTICS.

We fix a Banach space X with the Radon-Nikodym property, $f \in S_{X^*}$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. For $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define $\Lambda_p = \{x; f(x) \geq \varepsilon\|x\| + p\}$. For all p , Λ_p is a closed convex unbounded subset of X , $\Lambda_q \subset \Lambda_p$ whenever $p \leq q$, Λ_0 is a cone of X , and if $p \geq 0$, for all $x \in \Lambda_p$ and all $\tau \geq 1$, $\tau x \in \Lambda_p$. The following result says that if D is a convex set containing Λ_{p+1} , different from Λ_{p+1} , and included in Λ_p , then there exists a small slice of D that does not intersect Λ_{p+1} .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\eta > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and D be a closed convex set of X such that $\Lambda_{p+1} \subset D \subset \Lambda_p$ and $D \neq \Lambda_{p+1}$. Then, there exists $g \in X^*$, $\|g - f\| < \varepsilon$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$C = D \cap \{g < d\} \neq \emptyset, \quad C \cap \Lambda_{p+1} = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \text{diam}(C) < \eta.$$




Figure 2

Proof. Let us pick $x_0 \in D \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$. According to the Hahn-Banach Theorem, there exists $h \in X^*$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad h(x_0) < \inf\{h(x); x \in \Lambda_{p+1}\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\|h\| = 1$.

Claim 1 : $h(x) = 0$ implies $f(x) \leq \varepsilon\|x\|$.

Indeed, if $h(x) = 0$, then, for all $\tau > 0$, $h(\tau x + x_0) = h(x_0)$, hence, according to inequality (3.1), $f(\tau x + x_0) < \varepsilon\|\tau x + x_0\| + p + 1 \leq \tau\varepsilon\|x\| + \varepsilon\|x_0\| + p + 1$. On the other hand, $x_0 \in \Lambda_p$, so $f(x_0) \geq \varepsilon\|x_0\| + p$, and the above inequality implies

$$f(x) \leq \varepsilon\|x\| + \frac{1}{\tau}$$

The claim is proved since this is true for all $\tau > 0$.

Claim 2 : there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $\|f - \lambda h\| \leq \varepsilon$.

It follows from claim 1 and the Hahn-Banach theorem that there exists $h' \in X^*$ such that $\|h'\| = \varepsilon$ and for all $x \in \text{Ker}(h)$, $h'(x) = f(x)$. Therefore, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f - h' = \lambda h$. Pick $x \in \Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_{p+1}$. This implies that $\tau x \in \Lambda_{p+1}$ for all $\tau > 1$. If $h(x) < 0$, then $h(\tau x)$ tends to $-\infty$ as τ tends to $+\infty$, which contradicts the fact that $\tau x \in \Lambda_{p+1}$ for $\tau > 1$ and the fact that h is bounded below on Λ_{p+1} . Hence $h(x) \geq 0$. Let us prove that $\lambda > 0$. Otherwise, $h'(x) = f(x) - \lambda h(x) > \varepsilon \|x\|$, which contradicts the fact that $\|h'\| \leq \varepsilon$.

For $\tau \in (0, 1)$, we denote $h_\tau = (1 - \tau)\lambda h + \tau f$. Clearly, $\|h_\tau - f\| < \varepsilon$. If τ is small enough, h_τ also satisfies (3.1). Indeed, if we denote $m = \inf\{h(x); x \in \Lambda_{p+1}\}$, we have $m > h(x_0)$. Therefore,

$$\inf\{h_\tau(x); x \in \Lambda_{p+1}\} \geq (1 - \tau)\lambda m + \tau p > (1 - \tau)\lambda h(x_0) + \tau f(x_0)$$

whenever τ is small enough.

We now fix τ such that $h_\tau(x_0) < \inf\{h_\tau(x); x \in \Lambda_{p+1}\}$, we denote $\widehat{f} = h_\tau$, and we choose c such that $\widehat{f}(x_0) < c < \inf\{\widehat{f}(x); x \in \Lambda_{p+1}\}$. The open slice $S = D \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$ is non empty, does not intersect Λ_{p+1} , and it is bounded, because if x belongs to this slice, then $\|f - \widehat{f}\| \cdot \|x\| \geq (f - \widehat{f})(x) > \varepsilon \|x\| - c$, thus $\|x\| \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon - \|f - \widehat{f}\|}$.

By Lemma 2.2, there exists $g \in X^*$, $\|g - \widehat{f}\| < \varepsilon - \|f - \widehat{f}\|$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the non empty slice $C := D \cap \{g < d\}$ is contained in S (hence does not intersect Λ_{p+1}), and $\text{diam}(C) < \eta$. Clearly, $\|f - g\| \leq \|f - \widehat{f}\| + \|\widehat{f} - g\| < \varepsilon$. □

From now on, we fix $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. The following result gives the existence of a ‘‘slicing’’ of $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ into small pieces.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\eta > 0$. Then, there exists transfinite sequences $(f_\alpha) \in Y^*$ with $\|f_\alpha - f\| < \varepsilon$, and (c_α) in \mathbb{R} , such that, if $(D_\alpha)_{\alpha \leq \mu}$ is the transfinite decreasing sequence of closed convex sets defined as follows :*

- $D_0 = \Lambda_p$;
- for all α , $D_{\alpha+1} = D_\alpha \setminus \{f_\alpha < c_\alpha\}$
- $D_\alpha = \bigcap_{\gamma < \alpha} D_\gamma$ for all limit ordinal α ,

and if, for all α , $C_\alpha = D_\alpha \setminus D_{\alpha+1}$, then C_α is non empty, $\text{diam}(C_\alpha) < \eta$, $D_\mu = \Lambda_{p+1}$, and $\{C_\alpha; \alpha < \mu\}$ is a partition of $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$.

Proof. We prove the existence of f_α , c_α by transfinite induction. Let us assume that f_β and c_β have been constructed for $\beta < \alpha$. Hence, we have constructed $D_\alpha = \Lambda_p \cap (\bigcap_{\gamma < \alpha} \{f_\gamma \geq c_\gamma\})$. If $D_\alpha = \Lambda_{p+1}$, then we set $\mu = \alpha$ and we stop. Otherwise, we apply Lemma 3.1 with $D = D_\alpha$ to construct $g = f_\alpha$ and $d = c_\alpha$ such that, if $C_\alpha = D_\alpha \cap \{f_\alpha < c_\alpha\}$, then C_α is non empty and has diameter less than η . Moreover, since $C_\alpha \subset \Lambda_p$ and $C_\alpha \cap \Lambda_{p+1} = \emptyset$, we have that the union of the C_α is included in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$. The sets C_α , $\alpha < \mu$ are pairwise disjoint, and their union is equal to $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ because $D_\mu = \Lambda_{p+1}$, thus $\{C_\alpha; \alpha < \mu\}$ is a partition of $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$. □

We now define a mapping t_0 on $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\eta > 0$. There exists a mapping $t_0 : \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1} \rightarrow S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon)$ such that*

- *if $x \in \Lambda_p$ and $y \in X$ satisfy $\langle t_0(x), y - x \rangle \leq 0$, then $y \notin \Lambda_{p+1}$,*
- *for all sequence (x_n) in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$, if $\langle t_0(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then (x_n) is η -Cauchy.*

A mapping t_0 with the property of Proposition 3.3 will be called later on an η -winning tactic (player A can force the sequence (x_n) to be η -Cauchy).

Proof. Let us first define t_0 . First observe that if for $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, we have a mapping $t_0 : \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1} \rightarrow B(f, \varepsilon)$, then the function defined by $t_1(x) = t_0(x)/\|t_0(x)\|$ has its values in $S_{X^*} \cap B(f, 2\varepsilon)$ and $\langle t_1(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ is equivalent to $\langle t_0(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$. So it is enough to construct $t_0 : \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1} \rightarrow B(f, \varepsilon)$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 3.3. Let f_α be the functionals constructed in Lemma 3.2. For each α , we have $\|f - f_\alpha\| < \varepsilon$. If $x \in \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$, then there exist α such that $x \in C_\alpha$, and we set $t_0(x) = f_\alpha$.

Let us notice that if $x \in C_\alpha$, $y \in X$, and $\langle t_0(x), y - x \rangle \leq 0$, then $f_\alpha(y) \leq f_\alpha(x) < c_\alpha$ and the above inequality implies $y \notin D_{\alpha+1}$, and in particular $y \notin \Lambda_{p+1}$.

Let now (x_n) be a sequence in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ such that $\langle t_0(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let α_n be such that $x_n \in C_{\alpha_n}$. Since $t_0(x_n) = f_{\alpha_n}$ and $\langle t_0(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$, we obtain $f_{\alpha_n}(x_{n+1}) \leq f_{\alpha_n}(x_n)$. This implies that $x_{n+1} \notin D_{\alpha_n+1}$. But $x_{n+1} \in C_{\alpha_{n+1}}$, so $\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n$. Thus (α_n) is a nonincreasing sequence. The set $A = \{\alpha_n; n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset [0, \mu]$ is well ordered, so there exists n_0 such that $\alpha_{n_0} = \min A$. Then for all $n \geq n_0$, $\alpha_n = \alpha_0$. Now, for all $n, m \geq n_0$, we have $x_n, x_m \in C_{\alpha_0}$, so $\|x_n - x_m\| < \eta$. Thus the sequence (x_n) is η -Cauchy. \square

4. MULTI- ε -TACTICS.

Whenever E is a set, we denote $\mathcal{P}(E)$ the set of subsets of E .

Definition 4.1. *Let $T : A \subset X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X^*)$. We say that $t : A \rightarrow X^*$ is a selection of T if $t(x) \in T(x)$ for all $x \in A$.*

In Lemma 3.2, we have constructed $f_\alpha \in X^*$, $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $D_\alpha \subset X$ such that, if $C_\alpha = D_\alpha \setminus D_{\alpha+1} = D_\alpha \cap \{f_\alpha < c_\alpha\}$, then $\{C_\alpha; \alpha < \mu\}$ is a partition of $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$. We now define $R(x) = \frac{c_\alpha - f_\alpha(x)}{4 \max\{\|u\|; u \in C_\alpha\}}$ whenever $x \in C_\alpha$.

Proposition 4.2. *Under the notations of Lemma 3.2, let us define $T : \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon))$ by $T(x) = S_{X^*} \cap B(f, \varepsilon) \cap \overline{B}(f_\alpha, R(x))$ whenever $x \in C_\alpha$. Then, for each selection t of T , t is an η -winning tactic.*

Proof. Let t be a selection of T , and let us prove that the selection t is η winning. If $x \in C_\alpha$ and $t(x)(y) \leq t(x)(x)$ then, according to Lemma 2.1, $y \notin D_{\alpha+1}$, and in particular, $y \notin \Lambda_{p+1}$. Let now (x_n) be a sequence in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ such that $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let α_n be such that $x_n \in C_{\alpha_n}$. Since $t(x_n)(x_{n+1}) \leq t(x_n)(x_n)$ and $x_n \in C_{\alpha_n}$, we obtain that $x_{n+1} \notin D_{\alpha_n+1}$. But $x_{n+1} \in C_{\alpha_{n+1}}$, so $\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n$, hence (α_n) is a non increasing sequence of ordinals. Therefore the sequence (α_n) is stationary, and, as in the proof of Proposition 3.3, all the x_n except finitely many of them are in the same C_α which has diameter less than η . Thus, (x_n) is η -Cauchy. \square

5. A SEQUENCE OF MULTI- ε -TACTICS.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that X has the Radon-Nikodym property. Let $\eta, r > 0$ and D be a closed convex set of X . Let $\widehat{f} \in X^*$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $S = D \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$ is a non empty bounded set. Then, there exists transfinite sequences $(g_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta < \mu}$ in S_{X^*} and $(d_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta < \mu}$ in \mathbb{R} such that, if $(D_\beta)_{0 \leq \beta \leq \mu}$ is defined as follows :*

$$\text{for all } \beta \geq 0, D_\beta = D \cap \left(\bigcap_{\gamma < \beta} \{g_\gamma \geq d_\gamma\} \right)$$

Then, for all $\beta < \mu$, $D_\beta \supset D \cap \{\widehat{f} \geq c\}$, and, if we denote $C_\beta = D_\beta \setminus D_{\beta+1}$, we have

- (i) $C_\beta \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{diam}(C_\beta) < \eta$.
- (ii) $\|g_\beta - \widehat{f}\| < \min\{r, \inf\{R(u); u \in C_\beta\}\}$.
- (iii) $\{C_\beta; \beta < \mu\}$ is a partition of S .

Proof. We shall construct g_β and d_β by transfinite induction using Lemma 2.2 at each step. Let us assume that g_γ and d_γ have been constructed for $\gamma < \beta$. Hence $D_\beta = D \cap \left(\bigcap_{\gamma < \beta} \{g_\gamma \geq d_\gamma\} \right)$ is well defined (notice that $D_0 = D$).

If $D_\beta \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$ is non empty, it is also bounded because it is included in $S = D \cap \{\widehat{f} < c\}$. Applying Lemma 2.2 with D_β in place of D , we find g_β and d_β such that $C_\beta = D_\beta \cap \{g_\beta < d_\beta\}$ satisfies conditions (i), (ii) and $C_\beta \subset S$. This last condition implies that $D_{\beta+1} = D_\beta \setminus C_\beta \supset D \cap \{\widehat{f} \geq c\}$.

If $D_\beta = D \cap \{\widehat{f} \geq c\}$, then we set $\mu = \beta$ and we stop and condition (iii) is satisfied. \square

We are now ready to construct a decreasing sequence (T_k) of multi- ε -tactics.

Theorem 5.2. *Let us fix a sequence (η_k) converging to 0 such that $\eta_k > 0$ for all k . There exists a sequence (T_k) of multivalued functions from $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ to S_{X^*} such that $T_k(x) = S_{X^*} \cap \overline{B}(\widehat{f}_{x,k}, r_k(x))$, where $\widehat{f}_{x,k} \in S_{X^*}$, $r_k(x) > 0$, $r_k(x) \rightarrow 0$ and $T_{k+1}(x) \subset T_k(x)$, and with the property that, for all t selection of T_k , t is an η_k -winning tactic.*

Proof. The construction will be carried out by induction on k .

Construction of T_0 .

It is enough to apply Proposition 4.2 with $\eta = \eta_0$.

Induction step.

Assume $T_k(x) = S_{X^*} \cap \overline{B}(\widehat{f}_{x,k}, r_k(x))$ has been constructed with the following properties :

- There exists a partition of $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$, given by $C_{\alpha,k} = D_{\alpha,k} \cap \{f_{\alpha,k} < c_{\alpha,k}\}$ with $\alpha < \mu_k$, such that $\text{diam}(C_{\alpha,k}) < \eta_k$ and $\widehat{f}_{x,k} = f_{\alpha,k}$ whenever $x \in C_{\alpha,k}$.
- If $x \in C_{\alpha,k}$, $r_k(x) = \min\{R_k(x), r_k\}$, where $r_k > 0$ is constant on $C_{\alpha,k}$ and
$$R_k(x) = \frac{c_{\alpha,k} - f_{\alpha,k}(x)}{4 \max\{\|u\|; u \in C_{\alpha,k}\}}.$$
- For all t selection of T_k , t is an η_k -winning tactic.

Since $\{C_{\alpha,k}; \alpha < \mu_k\}$ is a partition of $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$, it is enough, for each $\alpha < \mu_k$, to define T_{k+1} on $C_{\alpha,k}$. Using Lemma 5.1 with $D = D_{\alpha,k}$, $\hat{f} = f_{\alpha,k}$ and $c = c_{\alpha,k}$, there exists $g_{\alpha,\beta} \in S_{X^*}$ and $d_{\alpha,\beta} \in \mathbb{R}$ for $\beta < \mu_{\alpha,k}$, such that $\|g_{\alpha,\beta} - \hat{f}_{x,k}\| < r_k(x)$, and, if

$$D_{\alpha,\beta} = D_{\alpha,k} \cap \left(\bigcap_{\beta < \mu_{\alpha,k}} \{g_{\alpha,\beta} \geq d_{\alpha,\beta}\} \right),$$

then $D_{\alpha,\beta+1} \supset D_{\alpha+1,k}$, $C_{\alpha,\beta} = D_{\alpha,\beta} \setminus D_{\alpha,\beta+1}$ is non empty, have diameter less than η_{k+1} and $\{C_{\alpha,\beta}; \beta < \mu_{\alpha,k}\}$ is a partition of $S = D_{\alpha,k} \cap \{f_{\alpha,k} < c_{\alpha,k}\} = C_{\alpha,k}$. For each $x \in C_{\alpha,\beta}$, we denote

$$\hat{f}_{x,k+1} = g_{\alpha,\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad r_{k+1} = \min \{r_k, \inf \{R_k(u); u \in C_{\alpha,\beta}\} - \|g_{\alpha,\beta} - f_{\alpha,k}\| > 0.$$

$R_{k+1}(x)$ is then defined by $R_{k+1}(x) = \frac{d_{\alpha,\beta} - g_{\alpha,\beta}(x)}{4 \max\{\|u\|; u \in C_{\alpha,\beta}\}}$. Therefore, we have defined $r_{k+1}(x) = \min \{R_{k+1}(x), r_{k+1}\}$ and $T_{k+1}(x) = S_{X^*} \cap \overline{B}(\hat{f}_{x,k+1}, r_{k+1}(x))$. We claim that $T_{k+1}(x) \subset T_k(x)$. Indeed, for $x \in C_{\alpha,\beta}$,

$$T_{k+1}(x) \subset \overline{B}(g_{\alpha,\beta}, r_{k+1}) \subset \overline{B}(f_{\alpha,k}, \|f_{\alpha,k} - g_{\alpha,\beta}\| + r_{k+1}) \subset \overline{B}(\hat{f}_{x,k}, r_k),$$

and, on the other hand,

$$T_{k+1}(x) \subset \overline{B}(g_{\alpha,\beta}, r_{k+1}) \subset \overline{B}(g_{\alpha,\beta}, R_k(x) - \|g_{\alpha,\beta} - f_{\alpha,k}\|) \subset \overline{B}(\hat{f}_{x,k}, R_k(x)).$$

If $x \in C_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $g \in T_{k+1}(x)$, since $\|g - g_{\alpha,\beta}\| \leq R_{k+1}(x)$, we can apply Lemma 2.1 with $D = D_{\alpha,\beta}$, $\hat{f} = g_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $c = d_{\alpha,\beta}$ to obtain $\{g \leq g(x)\} \cap D_{\alpha,\beta+1} = \emptyset$, and since $D_{\alpha,\beta+1} \supset D_{\alpha+1,k}$, we also have $\{g \leq g(x)\} \cap D_{\alpha+1,k} = \emptyset$. Thus, if $y \in X$ and $g(y) \leq g(x)$ then $y \notin \Lambda_{p+1} \subset D_{\alpha+1,k}$. Also, if $y \in \Lambda_p$ and $g(y) \leq g(x)$, then either $y \in C_{\alpha,\beta'}$ with $\beta' \leq \beta$ or $y \in C_{\alpha'}$ for some $\alpha' \leq \alpha$.

The set $E = \{(\alpha, \beta); \alpha < \mu_k, \beta < \mu_{\alpha,k}\}$ is well ordered by the relation $(\alpha, \beta) \leq (\alpha', \beta')$ if and only if either $\alpha = \alpha'$ and $\beta \leq \beta'$, or $\alpha \leq \alpha'$. So there exists a unique ordinal μ_{k+1} and an order preserving bijection from $\pi : [0, \mu_{k+1})$ onto E . We then define, for $\alpha < \mu_{k+1}$, $C_{\alpha,k+1} = C_{\pi(\alpha)}$, $f_{\alpha,k+1} = g_{\pi(\alpha)}$ and $c_{\alpha,k+1} = d_{\pi(\alpha)}$. Therefore $\{C_{\alpha,k+1}; \alpha \leq \mu_{k+1}\}$ is a partition of $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ into sets of diameter less than η_{k+1} . Moreover, if $x \in C_{\alpha,k+1}$ and $g \in T_{k+1}(x)$, then for all $y \in \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1} \cap \{g \leq g(x)\}$, there exists $\alpha' \leq \alpha$ such that $y \in C_{\alpha',k+1}$.

Let us now prove that, if t be a selection of T_{k+1} , then t is η_{k+1} -winning. If $x \in C_{\alpha,k+1}$ and $y \in X$ satisfy $t(x)(y) \leq t(x)(x)$, then $y \notin \Lambda_{p+1}$, and in the case $y \in \Lambda_p$, then $y \in C_{\alpha',k+1}$ for some $\alpha' \leq \alpha$. Let now (x_n) be a sequence in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ such that $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let α_n be such that $x_n \in C_{\alpha_n,k+1}$. Since $t(x_n)(x_{n+1}) \leq t(x_n)(x_n)$, we obtain that $\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n$. Thus (α_n) is a non increasing sequence of ordinals, hence there exists n_0 such that, for all $n \geq n_0$, $\alpha_n = \alpha_{n_0}$. All the x_n , except finitely many of them, are in $C_{\alpha_{n_0},k+1}$ which has diameter less than η_{k+1} . This proves that the sequence (x_n) is η_{k+1} -Cauchy. This completes the induction. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Proof. For each $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, we define $t(x)$ whenever $x \in \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$. In this case, $(T_k(x))$ is a decreasing sequence of closed sets in the Banach space X^* and $\text{diam}(T_k(x)) \rightarrow 0$. Therefore $\bigcap T_k(x)$ is a singleton, and we denote $t(x)$ the unique element of this intersection. Whenever $x \in \Lambda_p$, we have $t(x) \in T_1(x)$, so

$$x \in \Lambda_p \quad \text{and} \quad \langle t(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad y \notin \Lambda_{p+1}$$

Let us prove that t is a winning tactic in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$. Let us fix a sequence $(x_n) \in \Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ such that for each n , $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$. Since $t(x) \in T_k(x)$, the sequence is η_k -Cauchy. Since this is true for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence (x_n) converges. Now let (x_n) be a sequence such that the sequence $(f(x_n) - \varepsilon \|x_n\|)$ is bounded below and $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each n , there exists an integer $p_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $x_n \in \Lambda_{p_n} \setminus \Lambda_{p_n+1}$. Since $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$, $x_{n+1} \notin \Lambda_{p_n+1}$, so $p_{n+1} \leq p_n$. Since $(f(x_n) - \varepsilon \|x_n\|)$ is bounded below, the sequence (p_n) is bounded below. Thus (p_n) is a nonincreasing sequence which is bounded below, therefore there exists n_1 such that $p_n = p_{n_1} := p$ for all $n \leq n_1$. So, the whole sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq n_1}$ is included in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$. Since $t|_{\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}}$ is a winning tactic in $\Lambda_p \setminus \Lambda_{p+1}$ and $\langle t(x_n), x_{n+1} - x_n \rangle \leq 0$, the sequence (x_n) is convergent. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Bourgin, *Geometric Aspects of Convex Sets with the Radon-Nikodým Property*, Lecture Notes in Math. **993** (Springer, Berlin, 1983). MR704815 (85d:46023)
- [2] R. Deville and É. Matheron, *Infinite games, Banach Space geometry and the eikonal equation*, J. Funct. Anal. **220** (2005), 304-361.
- [3] R. Deville and J. Jaramillo, *Almost classical solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **24**, no. 3 (2008), 989-1010.
- [4] J. Malý and M. Zelený, *A note on Buchzolic's solution of the Weil gradient problem: A construction based on an infinite game*, Acta Math. Hungar. **113** (2006), 145-158.
- [5] R. Phelps, *Convex Functions, Monotone Operators and Differentiability*, 2nd Edition, Lecture Notes in Math. **1364** (Springer, Berlin, 1993). MR1238715 (94f:46055)
- [6] Antonín Procházka, *Winning tactics in a geometrical game*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), no. 3, 1051-1061.
- [7] M. Zelený, *The Denjoy-Clarkson property with respect to Hausdorff measures for the gradient mapping of functions of several variables*, Ann. Inst. Fourier. **58** (2008), no. 2, 405-428.

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BORDEAUX, UNIVERSITÉ BORDEAUX 1, 33405, TALENCE, FRANCE

E-mail address: Robert.Deville@mat.u-bordeaux1.fr

DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, 28040, MADRID, SPAIN

E-mail address: oscar.reynaldo@mat.ucm.es