

On some extension theorems for multifunctions

C. Zălinescu*

The extension of linear mappings dominated by convex multifunctions is a subject that interested quite many authors. When dealing with the continuous case problems appear and several false result were published. In the literature one can find correct versions of such results (of course, under more stringent conditions). It is our aim here to point out some false results published recently providing counterexamples. Note that in our paper [4] we mentioned two wrong results. In this short paper we refer to such results published after 2008.

We quote first [1, Th. 2.2].

Theorem 2.2 (Generalized Hahn Banach theorem in t.v.s.). Let X be a real t.v.s. and C a convex subset of X . Let (Y, K) be a real order-complete t.v.s. with order cone K . Let $P : C \rightrightarrows Y$ be a K -convex set-valued map with nonempty values. Let X_0 be a proper real linear subspace of X with $X_0 \cap \text{cor } C \neq \emptyset$ and $f : X_0 \rightrightarrows Y$ be a continuous (u.s.c., l.s.c., respectively) K -concave set-valued map with nonempty values satisfying

$$P(x) - f(x) \subset K$$

for all $x \in X_0 \cap C$. Then there exists a set-valued map with nonempty values $F : X \rightrightarrows Y$ such that

- (i) F is continuous (u.s.c., l.s.c., respectively);
- (ii) F is K -concave;
- (iii) F is an extension of f , i.e., $F(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in X_0$;
- (iv) $P(x) - F(x) \subset K$ for all $x \in C$.

The fact that P is K -convex means that $\{(x, y + k) \mid x \in X, y \in P(x), k \in K\}$ is convex; f is K -concave means that f is $(-K)$ -convex.

Example 1 Take X an infinite dimensional real normed vector space, $Y := \mathbb{R}$ endowed with the usual topology and $K := \mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$. Of course (Y, K) is a real order-complete t.v.s. Consider $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a linear non continuous function and $P : X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ defined by $P(x) := \{\varphi(x)\}$. Consider also $X_0 := \{0\} \subset X$ and $f : X_0 \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(0) := \{0\}$. With these data the hypothesis of [1, Th. 2.2] holds but its conclusion is not valid.

Clearly P is K -convex, and f is continuous and K -concave. Moreover, $C := X = \text{cor } C$, whence $0 \in X_0 \cap \text{cor } C$, and $P(x) - f(x) = \{0\} \subset K$ for $x \in X_0 \cap C = \{0\}$. Applying the theorem above, that is [1, Th. 2.2], we find $F : X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ which is K -concave, continuous, $F(0) = \{0\}$ and $\emptyset \neq \{\varphi(x)\} - F(x) \subset K$, that is $F(x) \subset \{\varphi(x)\} - \mathbb{R}_+$, for all $x \in X$. Since

*University Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Faculty of Mathematics, Iași, Romania, email: zalinesc@uaic.ro.

$\{0\} = F(0) \subset (-1, 1)$ and F is upper semicontinuous at 0, there exists $r > 0$ such that $\emptyset \neq F(x) \subset (-1, 1)$ for every $x \in U := \{u \in X \mid \|u\| \leq r\}$. Taking $x \in U$ and some $y \in F(x)$ we obtain that $-1 \leq y \in \{\varphi(x)\} - \mathbb{R}_+$; hence $\varphi(x) \geq -1$ for every $x \in U$. Therefore, φ is continuous, a contradiction.

The above example is also a counterexample for [1, Cor. 2.2]. Indeed, take the same P and $u = 0 \in X, v = 0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let us quote now [1, Th. 3.2].

Theorem 3.2 Let X be a real t.v.s. and C a convex subset of X . Let (Y, K) be a real order-complete t.v.s. with order cone K . Let $f : C \rightrightarrows Y$ be a K -convex set-valued map with nonempty values. Let X_0 be a proper real linear subspace of X with $X_0 \cap \text{cor } C \neq \emptyset$ and $P : X_0 \rightrightarrows Y$ be a continuous (u.s.c., l.s.c., respectively) K -concave set-valued map with nonempty values satisfying

$$P(x) - f(x) \subset K$$

for all $x \in X_0 \cap C$. Then there exists a set-valued map with nonempty values $G : X \rightrightarrows Y$ such that

- (i) G is continuous (u.s.c., l.s.c., respectively);
- (ii) G is K -concave;
- (iii) G is an extension of P , i.e., $G(x) = P(x)$ for all $x \in X_0$;
- (iv) $G(x) - f(x) \subset K$ for all $x \in C$.

Example 2 Take $X, X_0, (Y, K)$ and φ as in Example 1. Let $f : X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $f(x) := \{\varphi(x)\}$, and $P : X_0 \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $P(0) := \{0\}$. With these data the hypothesis of [1, Th. 3.2] holds but its conclusion is not valid.

Clearly, all the hypotheses of [1, Th. 3.2] hold. Applying this theorem we get $G : X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ with $G(0) = \{0\}, \emptyset \neq G(x) \subset \{\varphi(x)\} - \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $x \in X$ and G continuous. Since $G(0) = \{0\} \subset (-1, 1)$ and G is upper semicontinuous at 0, there exists $r > 0$ such that $G(x) \subset (-1, 1)$ for every $x \in U := \{u \in X \mid \|u\| \leq r\}$. Taking $x \in U$ and some $y \in G(x)$ we obtain that $1 \geq y \in \{\varphi(x)\} + \mathbb{R}_+$; hence $\varphi(x) \leq 1$ for every $x \in U$. Therefore, φ is continuous, a contradiction.

The above example is also a counterexample for [1, Cor. 3.2]. Indeed, take the same f and $u = 0 \in X, v = 0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

In [3] one says: ‘‘From Theorem 13 in [11] and its proof, we have the following result’’. (Surely, it is $T_0 \in L(X_0, Y)$ instead of $T_0 \in L(X, Y)$.)

Let us quote [3, Th. 2.1].

Theorem 2.1 ([11]). Let (Y, K) have the least upper bound property, $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ be a K -convex set-valued mapping, $X_0 \subset X$ be a linear subspace and $T_0 \in L(X, Y)$. Suppose that $0 \in \text{int}(\text{dom } F - X_0)$ and $T_0(x) \not\supseteq y$ for all $(x, y) \in \text{gph } F \cap (X_0 \times Y)$. Then there exists $T \in L(X, Y)$ such that $T|_{X_0} = T_0$ and $T(x) \not\supseteq y$ for all $(x, y) \in \text{gph } F$. Moreover, T can be defined by $T(x) = T_0(x_0) - \langle x_1, x^* \rangle \bar{y}$, where $\bar{y} \in \text{int } K, x^* \in X'$ and the linear subspace $X_1 \subset X$ with $X = X_0 \oplus X_1$ are fixed, and $x = x_0 + x_1$ with $x_0 \in X_0$ and $x_1 \in X_1$.

In the theorem above X, Y are real linear topological spaces, and $L(X, Y)$ is the set of all linear continuous operators from X into Y ; furthermore, $X' = L(X, \mathbb{R})$, and $K \subset Y$ is a proper pointed closed convex cone with nonempty interior $\text{int } K$.

Example 3 Take $X, X_0, (Y, K)$ and φ as in Example 1. Let $F : X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $F(x) := \{\varphi(x)\}$ and $T_0 : X_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $T_0(0) := \{0\}$. With these data the hypothesis of [3, Th. 2.1] holds but its conclusion is not valid.

Clearly, all the hypotheses of [3, Th. 2.1] are satisfied; applying it we get $T \in L(X, \mathbb{R}) = X'$ such that $T(x) \not\leq y$ for all $(x, y) \in \text{gph } F$, that is $T(x) \leq \varphi(x)$ for all $x \in X$. It follows that $T = \varphi$, and so we get the contradiction that φ is continuous.

Example 3 is also a counterexample for [3, Th. 3.1] quoted below; just take $(x_0, y_0) := (0, 0)$.

Theorem 3.1. Let (Y, K) have the least upper bound property, $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ be a K -convex set-valued mapping with $\text{int}(\text{dom } F) \neq \emptyset$. If there exist $x_0 \in \text{int}(\text{dom } F)$ and $y_0 \in F(x_0)$ such that $F(x_0) \cap (y_0 - \text{int } K) = \emptyset$, then $\partial^{Y-W} F(x_0, y_0) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, there is a Y -weak subgradient T of F at (x_0, y_0) satisfying that for every $x \in \text{dom } F$,

$$T(x - x_0) \notin -\text{int } K \Leftrightarrow T(x - x_0) \in K.$$

Here, for $(x_0, y_0) \in \text{gph } F$,

$$\partial^{Y-W} F(x_0, y_0) := \{T \in L(X, Y) \mid y - y_0 - T(x - x_0) \notin -\text{int } K \ \forall (x, y) \in \text{gph } F\}.$$

Example 3 is a counterexample for [2, Th. 3.1] quoted below, too; just take $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) := (0, 0)$.

Theorem 3.1 Let (Y, K) have the order-complete property, $F : X \rightarrow 2^Y$ be a K -convex set-valued mapping with $\text{int}(\text{dom } F) \neq \emptyset$. If there exist $\bar{x} \in \text{int}(\text{dom } F)$ and $\bar{y} \in F(\bar{x})$ such that $F(\bar{x}) - \bar{y} \subset K$, then $\partial F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \neq \emptyset$.

Here, X, Y are real normed spaces, $L(X, Y)$ is the set of all linear continuous operators from X to Y , $K \subset Y$ is a proper pointed closed convex cone with nonempty interior $\text{int } K$, and for $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \text{gph } F$,

$$\partial F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) := \{T \in L(X, Y) \mid y - \bar{y} - T(x - \bar{x}) \in K \ \forall (x, y) \in \text{gph } F\}.$$

References

- [1] Du, W.S.: The extension of continuity and generalized results for set-valued maps in convex analysis. *Nonlinear Anal.* **71**(7-8), 3176–3184 (2009)
- [2] Guo, X.L., Li, S.J., Teo, K.L.: Subdifferential and optimality conditions for the difference of set-valued mappings. *Positivity* **16**(2), 321–337 (2012)
- [3] Li, S.J., Guo, X.L.: Weak subdifferential for set-valued mappings and its applications. *Nonlinear Anal.* **71**(11), 5781–5789 (2009)
- [4] Zălinescu, C.: Hahn-Banach extension theorems for multifunctions revisited. *Math. Methods Oper. Res.* **68**(3), 493–508 (2008)