

# ON COMPLETE METRIZABILITY OF THE HAUSDORFF METRIC TOPOLOGY

LÁSZLÓ ZSILINSZKY

ABSTRACT. There exists a completely metrizable bounded metrizable space  $X$  with compatible metrics  $d, d'$  so that the hyperspace  $CL(X)$  of nonempty closed subsets of  $X$  endowed with the Hausdorff metric  $H_d, H_{d'}$ , resp. is  $\alpha$ -favorable,  $\beta$ -favorable, resp. in the strong Choquet game. In particular, there exists a completely metrizable bounded metric space  $(X, d)$  such that  $(CL(X), H_d)$  is not completely metrizable.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The *Hausdorff metric topology*  $\tau_{H_d}$  on the hyperspace  $CL(X)$  of nonempty closed subsets of a given metric space  $(X, d)$  is one of the oldest and best-studied hypertopologies due to its applicability to various areas of mathematics [1, 2, 4, 20]. The main reason for this interest is the following well known fact [4, §3.2.]: if  $(X, d)$  is a bounded complete metric space, then  $(CL(X), H_d)$  is a complete metric space, where  $H_d$  is the *Hausdorff metric* on  $CL(X)$  defined as

(1)  $H_d(A_0, A_1) = \sup\{|d(x, A_0) - d(x, A_1)| : x \in X\}$ , for  $A_0, A_1 \in CL(X)$ , and  $d(x, A) = \inf\{d(x, a) : a \in A\}$  is the distance from  $x \in X$  to  $A \in CL(X)$ . If  $d$  is not bounded,  $H_d$  is only an infinite-valued distance, which generates the topology  $\tau_{H_d}$  on  $CL(X)$ ; moreover, since  $d' = \min\{1, d\}$  is an equivalent to  $d$  bounded metric on  $X$  and  $\tau_{H_{d'}} = \tau_{H_d}$ , we get

**Theorem 1.1.**

*If  $(X, d)$  is complete, then  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  is completely metrizable.*

Various completeness-type properties of the Hausdorff metric topology are stock theorems in topology, e.g.  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  is compact (resp. totally bounded) iff  $X$  is [4, 17]; more recently, local compactness [12], and cofinal completeness [6] have been characterized for  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$ ; however, despite the above considerations and other partial results (see below), a characterization of complete metrizability of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  is unknown. Observe that the Hausdorff distance is sensitive to its generating metric, more precisely,  $\tau_{H_d} = \tau_{H_{d'}}$  iff  $d, d'$  are uniformly equivalent metrics on  $X$  [4, Theorem 3.3.2.],

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 54B20; Secondary 54E50, 54E52, 91A44.

*Key words and phrases*. Hausdorff distance, hyperspace, complete metrizability, strong Choquet game, Banach-Mazur game.

thus, it is not automatic to argue that *complete metrizability* of  $(X, d)$  is sufficient for complete metrizability of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  even though it is clearly necessary, since  $(X, d)$  embeds as a closed subspace of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$ . It is the purpose of this note to demonstrate that complete metrizability of  $(X, d)$ , in fact, is not sufficient for complete metrizability of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$ , contrary to some claims in the literature [3].

To put this question in perspective, briefly review the known results related to complete metrizability of the Hausdorff metric topology: it was *Effros* [16, Lemma] who showed that for  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  to be Polish (i.e. completely metrizable and separable), it is sufficient that  $(X, d)$  is completely metrizable and totally bounded, which is in turn also necessary, since separability of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  is equivalent to total boundedness of  $X$  [4, Theorem 3.2.3.], and  $X$  sits in  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  as a closed subspace. It is possible to improve on this results using the work of *Costantini* [10] about another related hyperspace topology, the so-called *Wijsman topology*  $\tau_{W_d}$  [4]: to explain this, it is useful to view  $CL(X)$  as sitting in the space  $C(X)$  of real-valued continuous functions defined on  $X$  via the identification  $A \leftrightarrow d(\cdot, A)$ , since, by (1),  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  is then a subspace of  $C(X)$  with the uniform topology, while  $(CL(X), \tau_{W_d})$  is a subspace of  $C(X)$  with the topology of pointwise convergence. This immediately implies that  $\tau_{W_d} \subseteq \tau_{H_d}$ , in particular,  $G_\delta$ -subsets of  $(CL(X), \tau_{W_d})$  are  $G_\delta$ -subsets of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  as well, which helps us to prove

**Theorem 1.2.**

*If  $(X, d)$  is Polish, then  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  is completely metrizable.*

*Proof.* It follows from [10] that  $CL(X)$  is a  $G_\delta$ -set of  $(CL(\tilde{X}), \tau_{W_{\tilde{d}}})$ , where  $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{d})$  is the completion of  $(X, d)$ . Thus,  $CL(X)$  is also  $G_\delta$  in  $(CL(\tilde{X}), \tau_{H_{\tilde{d}}})$ , therefore, by Theorem 1.1,  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  is completely metrizable, since mapping  $A \in CL(X)$  onto the  $\tilde{X}$ -closure of  $A$  is an isometric embedding of  $(CL(X), H_d)$  into  $(CL(\tilde{X}), H_{\tilde{d}})$  [16].  $\square$

Knowing that  $\tau_{W_d} = \tau_{H_d}$  on  $CL(X)$  iff  $(X, d)$  is totally bounded [4, Theorem 3.2.3.], it is not surprising that in the above results of Effros and Costantini the Hausdorff metric and Wijsman topologies interact in studying complete metrizability of the hyperspaces, however, when a totally bounded metric is not available on  $X$ , i.e. when  $X$  is a non-separable metric space, the two topologies have no effect on each other. Therefore the wealth of completeness results on the Wijsman topology [5, 11, 27, 8, 13] is not applicable in our case, which demonstrates a fundamental difference between these topologies.

Since complete metrizability of a metrizable space is equivalent to its Čech-completeness (i.e. being  $G_\delta$  in a compactification [17]), the recent characterization of local compactness of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  by *Costantini, Levi, Pelant* in [12, Corollary 15], as well as of the intermediary property of cofinal

completeness of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  by *Beer, Di Maio* in [6, Theorem 3.9.] must be mentioned here, as they both imply complete metrizability of  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$ .

The main results of this paper, proved in Section 3, use topological games, namely the so-called strong Choquet game and the Banach-Mazur game, which are reviewed in Section 2, along with some relevant results about them. As mentioned in the abstract and introduction, our results will demonstrate that complete metrizability of  $(X, d)$  does not guarantee the same for the Hausdorff metric topology, more specifically,  $(CL(X), \tau_{H_d})$  may not have any closed-hereditary completeness property, since it contains a closed copy of the rationals; however, we will show this hyperspace still contains a dense completely metrizable subspace, and thus, is a Baire space.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Given a metric space  $(X, d)$ ,  $A \in C(X)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , denote by

$$B_d(A, \varepsilon) = \{x \in X : d(x, A) < \varepsilon\}$$

the open  $\varepsilon$ -hull of  $A$ , and use  $B_d(x, \varepsilon)$  instead of  $B_d(\{x\}, \varepsilon)$  for the open  $\varepsilon$ -ball about  $x$ . In addition to (1), there is an equivalent definition for the Hausdorff distance  $H_d$ :

$$H_d(A_0, A_1) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : A_0 \subseteq B_d(A_1, \varepsilon) \text{ and } A_1 \subseteq B_d(A_0, \varepsilon)\},$$

whenever  $A_0, A_1 \in CL(X)$  [4, 17].

In the *strong Choquet game*  $Ch(Z)$  (cf. [9, 19]) players  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  take turns in choosing objects in the topological space  $Z$  with an open base  $\mathcal{B}$ :  $\beta$  starts by picking  $(z_0, V_0)$  from  $\mathcal{E} = \{(z, V) \in Z \times \mathcal{B} : z \in V\}$  and  $\alpha$  responds by  $U_0 \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $z_0 \in U_0 \subseteq V_0$ . The next choice of  $\beta$  is  $(z_1, V_1) \in \mathcal{E}$  with  $V_1 \subseteq U_0$  and again  $\alpha$  picks  $U_1$  with  $z_1 \in U_1 \subseteq V_1$  etc. Player  $\alpha$  wins the run  $(z_0, V_0), U_0, \dots, (z_n, V_n), U_n, \dots$  provided  $\bigcap_n U_n = \bigcap_n V_n \neq \emptyset$ ; otherwise,  $\beta$  wins. A *strategy* in  $Ch(Z)$  for  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\beta$ ) is a function  $\sigma : \mathcal{E}^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  (resp.  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} z_n \in \sigma((z_0, V_0), \dots, (z_n, V_n)) &\subseteq V_n \text{ for all } ((z_0, V_0), \dots, (z_n, V_n)) \in \mathcal{E}^{<\omega} \\ \text{(resp. } \sigma(\emptyset) = (z_0, V_0) \text{ and } V_n &\subseteq U_{n-1}, \text{ where } \sigma(U_0, \dots, U_{n-1}) = (z_n, V_n) \\ &\text{for all } (U_0, \dots, U_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{B}^n, n \geq 1). \end{aligned}$$

A strategy  $\sigma$  for  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\beta$ ) is a *winning strategy*, if  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\beta$ ) wins every run of  $Ch(Z)$  compatible with  $\sigma$ , i.e. such that  $\sigma(z_0, V_0), \dots, (z_n, V_n) = U_n$  for all  $n < \omega$  (resp.  $\sigma(\emptyset) = (z_0, V_0)$  and  $\sigma(U_0, \dots, U_{n-1}) = (z_n, V_n)$  for all  $n \geq 1$ ). The strong Choquet game  $Ch(Z)$  is  $\alpha$ -,  $\beta$ -favorable, respectively, provided  $\alpha$ , resp.  $\beta$  has a winning strategy in  $Ch(Z)$ . This game has been studied in general topological spaces [22, 7, 15, 14, 28], however, the two fundamental results about it concern metrizable ones:

- **Choquet** [9, 19] A metrizable space  $X$  is completely metrizable if and only if  $Ch(X)$  is  $\alpha$ -favorable.

- **Debs-Porada-Telgársky** [14, 24, 25] A metrizable space  $X$  contains a closed copy of the rationals if and only if  $Ch(X)$  is  $\beta$ -favorable.

The *Banach-Mazur game*  $BM(Z)$  (see [18], also referred to as the Choquet game [19]) is played as the strong Choquet game, except  $\beta$ 's choice is only a nonempty open set contained in the previous choice of  $\alpha$ . The notions of  $\alpha$ -,  $\beta$ -favorability of  $BM(Z)$  are defined analogously to those of  $Ch(Z)$ . Two key results about the Banach-Mazur game are as follows:

- **Oxtoby** [23, 26] A metrizable space  $X$  contains a dense completely metrizable subspace if and only if  $BM(X)$  is  $\alpha$ -favorable.
- **Oxtoby-Krom** [23, 18, 19] A topological space  $X$  is a Baire space (i.e. countable intersections of dense open subsets of  $X$  are dense) if and only if  $BM(X)$  is not  $\beta$ -favorable.

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

Our main result is as follows:

**Theorem 3.1.** *There exists a bounded metric space  $(X, d)$  such that*

- (1)  $X$  is completely metrizable,
- (2)  $(CL(X), H_d)$  contains a closed copy of the rationals; in particular,  $(CL(X), H_d)$  is not completely metrizable,
- (3)  $(CL(X), H_d)$  is  $\alpha$ -favorable in the Banach-Mazur game; in particular,  $(CL(X), H_d)$  is a Baire space.

*Proof.* (1) Consider the product space  $\mathbb{R}^\omega$ , where  $\mathbb{R}$  has the discrete topology. This topology is metrizable by the Baire metric

$$d(f, g) = \frac{1}{\min\{n + 1 : f(n) \neq g(n)\}}$$

for  $f, g \in \mathbb{R}^\omega$ . Denote  $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^\omega : x(0) \neq 0 \text{ and } x(k) = 0 \text{ for all } k > 0\}$ , and put  $X = \mathbb{R}^\omega \setminus F$ . It is clear that  $F$  is closed in  $\mathbb{R}^\omega$ , so  $X$  is an open subspace of the complete space  $(\mathbb{R}^\omega, d)$ , and hence,  $(X, d)$  is completely metrizable.

(2) By the Debs-Porada-Telgársky Theorem, we need to show that  $(CL(X), H_d)$  is  $\beta$ -favorable in the strong Choquet game: let  $\{I_n^0 \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} : n < \omega\}$  be a sequence of pairwise disjoint closed bounded intervals, and denote by  $I_0$  their union. For each  $t \in I_0$  define  $x_t^0 \in X$  via

$$x_t^0(k) = \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t \in I_n^0, k = 0 \text{ or } k > n + 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } t \in I_n^0, 1 \leq k \leq n + 1. \end{cases}$$

Define  $A_0 = \{x_t^0 : t \in I_0\} \in CL(X)$ ,  $\mathbf{V}_0 = B_{H_d}(A_0, 1)$ , and let  $(A_0, \mathbf{V}_0)$  be  $\beta$ 's initial step in  $Ch(CL(X), H_d)$ . Let  $\mathbf{U}_0 = B_{H_d}(A_0, \frac{1}{n_0})$  be  $\alpha$ 's response, where  $1 \leq n_0 < \omega$ . Proceeding inductively, assume we have defined a

partial run  $(A_0, \mathbf{V}_0), \mathbf{U}_0, \dots, (A_m, \mathbf{V}_m), \mathbf{U}_m$  of the strong Choquet game in  $(CL(X), H_d)$ , where

$$\mathbf{U}_i = B_{H_d} \left( A_i, \frac{1}{\sum_{j \leq i} n_j} \right)$$

for some  $1 \leq n_i < \omega$  whenever  $i \leq m$ . Moreover, for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$  a sequence  $\{I_n^i \subset I_{n_{i-1}+1}^{i-1} : n < \omega\}$  of pairwise disjoint closed bounded intervals with union  $I_i$  be chosen, as well as  $x_t^i \in X$  for each  $t \in I_0$  so that  $x_t^i = x_t^{i-1}$  whenever  $t \in I_0 \setminus I_i$ , and for  $t \in I_i$

$$x_t^i(k) = \begin{cases} x_t^{i-1}(k), & \text{if } t \in I_n^i, k \leq \sum_{j < i} n_j, \\ 0, & \text{if } t \in I_n^i, \sum_{j < i} n_j < k \leq 1 + n + \sum_{j < i} n_j, \\ t, & \text{if } t \in I_n^i, k > 1 + n + \sum_{j < i} n_j. \end{cases}$$

Then let  $A_i = \{x_t^i : t \in I_0\}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_i = B_{H_d}(A_i, \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j < i} n_j})$ . Choose a sequence of pairwise disjoint closed bounded intervals  $\{I_n^{m+1} \subset I_{n_m+1}^m : n < \omega\}$  with union  $I_{m+1}$ , and define  $x_t^{m+1} = x_t^m$  for each  $t \in I_0 \setminus I_{m+1}$ , and for  $t \in I_{m+1}$  put

$$x_t^{m+1}(k) = \begin{cases} x_t^m(k), & \text{if } t \in I_n^{m+1}, k \leq \sum_{i \leq m} n_i, \\ 0, & \text{if } t \in I_n^{m+1}, \sum_{i \leq m} n_i < k \leq 1 + n + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i, \\ t, & \text{if } t \in I_n^{m+1}, k > 1 + n + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i. \end{cases}$$

Define  $A_{m+1} = \{x_t^{m+1} : t \in I_0\}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{m+1} = B_{H_d}(A_{m+1}, \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i})$ .

CLAIM 3.1.1.  $\mathbf{V}_{m+1} \subseteq \mathbf{U}_m$ .

Indeed, if  $A \in \mathbf{V}_{m+1}$ , then  $A \subseteq B_d(A_{m+1}, \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i})$ , so for all  $a \in A$  there is some  $x_t^{m+1} \in A_{m+1}$  with  $d(a, x_t^{m+1}) < \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i}$ , which implies

$$(2) \quad a(k) = x_t^{m+1}(k) \text{ for all } k \leq \sum_{i \leq m} n_i.$$

If  $t \in I_0 \setminus I_{m+1}$ , then

$$d(a, x_t^m) = d(a, x_t^{m+1}) < \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i} < \frac{1}{\sum_{i \leq m} n_i};$$

if  $t \in I_{m+1}$ , then  $t \in I_n^{m+1}$  for some  $n < \omega$ . It follows from the definition of  $x_t^{m+1}$ , and (2) that

$$d(a, x_t^m) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i} < \frac{1}{\sum_{i \leq m} n_i},$$

so we have  $A \subseteq B_d(A_m, \frac{1}{\sum_{i \leq m} n_i})$ . A similar argument shows that

$$A_{m+1} \subseteq B_d \left( A, \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i} \right) \text{ implies } A_m \subseteq B_d \left( A, \frac{1}{\sum_{i \leq m} n_i} \right),$$

thus,  $A \in \mathbf{U}_m$ . As a consequence of Claim 3.1.1, we have that putting  $\sigma_{Ch}(\emptyset) = (A_0, \mathbf{V}_0)$ , and  $\sigma_{Ch}(\mathbf{U}_0, \dots, \mathbf{U}_m) = (A_{m+1}, \mathbf{V}_{m+1})$  whenever  $m < \omega$ , defines a strategy for player  $\beta$  in the strong Choquet game on  $(CL(X), H_d)$ . We will be done if we prove

CLAIM 3.1.2.  $\sigma_{Ch}$  is a winning strategy for  $\beta$  in  $Ch(CL(X), H_d)$ .

To show this, consider a run

$$(A_0, \mathbf{V}_0), \mathbf{U}_0, \dots, (A_m, \mathbf{V}_m), \mathbf{U}_m, \dots$$

of  $Ch(CL(X), H_d)$  compatible with  $\sigma_{Ch}$ , and assume  $A \in \bigcap_{m < \omega} \mathbf{V}_m$ . If we choose some  $t \in \bigcap_{m < \omega} I_{n_{m+1}}^m$ , note that for every  $m < \omega$ ,

$$(3) \quad x_t^m(k) = 0 \text{ for all } 0 < k \leq 1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i.$$

Since  $A \in \mathbf{V}_0$ , there is some  $a \in A$  with  $d(x_t^0, a) < 1$ , thus,

$$(4) \quad a(0) = x_t^0(0) = t.$$

Since  $a \in X$ , there exists  $0 < k$  so that

$$(5) \quad a(k) \neq 0.$$

Choose  $m < \omega$  so that  $k \leq 1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i$ . Since  $A \in \mathbf{V}_m$ , there exists an

$x_{t'}^m \in A_m$  with  $d(a, x_{t'}^m) < \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i}$ , which implies that

$$(6) \quad x_{t'}^m(0) = a(0), \text{ and}$$

$$(7) \quad x_{t'}^m(k) = a(k).$$

Using (4),(6) we get

$$t' = x_{t'}^m(0) = a(0) = x_t^0(0) = t,$$

so  $t' = t$ . This would yield, by (7),(3), that

$$a(k) = x_{t'}^m(k) = x_t^m(k) = 0,$$

which contradicts (5). In conclusion, we got that  $\bigcap_{m < \omega} \mathbf{V}_m = \emptyset$ , and so  $\beta$  wins in  $Ch(CL(X), H_d)$ .

(3) Let  $\mathbf{V}_0$  be  $\beta$ 's initial step in  $BM(CL(X), H_d)$ , where  $\mathbf{V}_0 = B_{H_d}(A_0, \frac{1}{n_0})$  for some  $A_0 \in CL(X)$  and  $n_0 \geq 1$ . For each  $a_0 \in A_0$  define  $x_{a_0} \in X$  via

$$x_{a_0}(k) = \begin{cases} a_0(k), & \text{if } k < 2n_0 - 1, \\ n_0 + 1, & \text{if } k \geq 2n_0 - 1, \end{cases}$$

put  $C_0 = \{x_{a_0} : a_0 \in A_0\}$ . Then  $C_0 \in CL(X)$ , and  $H_d(A_0, C_0) \leq \frac{1}{2n_0}$ . Define  $\mathbf{U}_0 = B_{H_d}(C_0, \frac{1}{2n_0})$ . Then  $\mathbf{U}_0 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_0$  (since if  $A \in \mathbf{U}_0$ , then  $H_d(A, C_0) < \frac{1}{2n_0}$ , so  $H_d(A_0, A) \leq H_d(A, C_0) + H_d(C_0, A_0) < \frac{1}{n_0}$ ), so we can take  $\mathbf{U}_0$  as  $\alpha$ 's first step in  $BM(CL(X), H_d)$ .

Assume we have defined a partial run  $\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{U}_0, \dots, \mathbf{V}_m, \mathbf{U}_m$  of the Banach-Mazur game in  $(CL(X), H_d)$ , where

$$\mathbf{V}_i = B_{H_d}\left(A_i, \frac{1}{n_i}\right) \text{ and } \mathbf{U}_i = B_{H_d}\left(C_i, \frac{1}{2n_i}\right)$$

for some  $2n_{i-1} \leq n_i < \omega$  whenever  $i \leq m$  (for convenience, define  $n_{-1} = \frac{1}{2}$ ). Moreover, for each  $i \leq m$  let  $C_i = \{x_{a_i} : a_i \in A_i\}$ , where

$$(8) \quad x_{a_i}(k) = \begin{cases} a_i(k), & \text{if } k < 2n_i - 1, \\ 1 + \sum_{j \leq i} n_j, & \text{if } k \geq 2n_i - 1. \end{cases}$$

Take  $\mathbf{V}_{m+1} = B_{H_d}(A_{m+1}, \frac{1}{n_{m+1}}) \subseteq \mathbf{U}_m$ . For any  $a_{m+1} \in A_{m+1}$  define

$$y_{a_{m+1}}(k) = \begin{cases} a_{m+1}(k), & \text{if } k < n_{m+1}, \\ 2 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i, & \text{if } k \geq n_{m+1}. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\{y_{a_{m+1}} : a_{m+1} \in A_{m+1}\} \in \mathbf{V}_{m+1} \subseteq \mathbf{U}_m$ , so there exists  $x_{a_m} \in C_m$  for some  $a_m \in A_m$  so that  $d(y_{a_{m+1}}, x_{a_m}) < \frac{1}{2n_m}$ . If  $n_{m+1} < 2n_m$ , then

$$y_{a_{m+1}}(2n_m - 1) = 2 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i \text{ and}$$

$$x_{a_m}(2n_m - 1) = 1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i,$$

so  $d(y_{a_{m+1}}, x_{a_m}) \geq \frac{1}{2n_m}$ , which is impossible, thus,  $n_{m+1} \geq 2n_m$ . It also follows from  $\mathbf{V}_{m+1} \subseteq \mathbf{U}_m$  that  $H_d(A_{m+1}, C_m) < \frac{1}{2n_m}$ . Hence, for each  $a_m \in A_m$  there exists  $a_{m+1} \in A_{m+1}$  with  $d(x_{a_m}, a_{m+1}) < \frac{1}{2n_m}$ , so

$$(9) \quad a_{m+1}(k) = \begin{cases} a_m(k), & \text{if } k < 2n_m - 1, \\ 1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i, & \text{if } k = 2n_m - 1. \end{cases}$$

Define  $C_{m+1} = \{x_{a_{m+1}} : a_{m+1} \in A_{m+1}\}$ , where

$$(10) \quad x_{a_{m+1}}(k) = \begin{cases} a_{m+1}(k), & \text{if } k < 2n_{m+1} - 1, \\ 1 + \sum_{i \leq m+1} n_i, & \text{if } k \geq 2n_{m+1} - 1, \end{cases}$$

and put  $\mathbf{U}_{m+1} = B_{H_d}(C_{m+1}, \frac{1}{2n_{m+1}})$ . Note that  $H_d(A_{m+1}, C_{m+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2n_{m+1}}$ , so  $\mathbf{U}_{m+1} \subseteq \mathbf{V}_{m+1}$ , since if  $A \in \mathbf{U}_{m+1}$ , then  $H_d(C_{m+1}, A) < \frac{1}{2n_{m+1}}$ , thus,  $H_d(A_{m+1}, A) \leq H_d(A_{m+1}, C_{m+1}) + H_d(C_{m+1}, A) < \frac{1}{n_{m+1}}$ . This means that putting  $\sigma_{BM}(\mathbf{V}_0, \dots, \mathbf{V}_m) = \mathbf{U}_m$  for all  $m < \omega$  defines a strategy for  $\alpha$  in  $BM(CL(X), H_d)$ .

CLAIM 3.1.3.  $\sigma_{BM}$  is a winning strategy for  $\alpha$  in  $BM(CL(X), H_d)$ .

To show this, consider a run  $\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{U}_0, \dots, \mathbf{V}_m, \mathbf{U}_m, \dots$  of the Banach-Mazur game in  $(CL(X), H_d)$  compatible with  $\sigma_{BM}$ . For any  $m < \omega$  and  $a_m \in A_m$  we get an  $a_{m+1} \in A_{m+1}$  satisfying (9). Then for any  $a_0 \in A_0$  we can define the nonempty

$$A_1[a_0] = \{a_1 \in A_1 : a_1(k) = a_0(k) \text{ for all } k < 2n_0 - 1\}.$$

Assume, by induction, that we have defined  $A_m[a_{m-1}] \neq \emptyset$  for some  $a_{m-1} \in A_{m-1}$  and  $m \geq 1$ . For every  $a_m \in A_m[a_{m-1}]$  put

$$A_{m+1}[a_m] = \{a_{m+1} \in A_{m+1} : a_{m+1}(k) = a_m(k) \text{ for all } k < 2n_m - 1\},$$

which is nonempty by (9); for convenience, also define  $A_0[a_{-1}] = A_0$ . Denote

$$P = \{(a_m)_{m \geq 0} : a_m \in A_m[a_{m-1}] \text{ for all } m \geq 0\},$$

and for any  $p = (a_m)_{m \geq 0} \in P$  define  $s_p$  as follows:

$$(11) \quad s_p(k) = \begin{cases} a_0(k), & \text{if } k < 2n_0 - 1, \\ a_m(k), & \text{if } 2n_{m-1} - 1 \leq k < 2n_m - 1, \quad m \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note, by (9), that  $s_p(2n_m - 1) = 1 + \sum_{i \leq m} n_i$  for every  $m < \omega$ , so  $s_p \in X$  for each  $p \in P$ . Denote by  $S$  the  $X$ -closure of the set  $\{s_p : p \in P\}$ .

Given any  $s_p \in S$ , we have a sequence  $p = (a_m)_{m \geq 0} \in P$  such that  $a_i(k) = a_{i-1}(k)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $k < 2n_i - 1$ , which implies by (11) that  $a_m(k) = s_p(k)$  for all  $k < 2n_m - 1$ .

It follows that  $d(s_p, A_m) \leq d(s_p, a_m) \leq \frac{1}{2n_m}$ , so  $d(s, A_m) \leq \frac{1}{2n_m} < \frac{1}{n_m}$  for each  $s \in S$ , thus,

$$(12) \quad S \subseteq B_{H_d}\left(A_m, \frac{1}{n_m}\right).$$

Furthermore, for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $A_i \in \mathbf{V}_i \subseteq \mathbf{U}_{i-1}$ , so for any  $a_i \in A_i$  there exists  $a_{i-1} \in A_{i-1}$  with  $d(x_{a_{i-1}}, a_i) < \frac{1}{2n_{i-1}}$ , which means that  $a_i(k) = x_{a_{i-1}}(k)$  for each  $k \leq 2n_{i-1} - 1$ , so by (8),

$$(13) \quad a_i(k) = a_{i-1}(k) \text{ for each } k < 2n_{i-1} - 1;$$

moreover, if  $i > m$  we can choose by (9),  $a_i \in A_i$  so that (13) is satisfied. It follows that  $a_i \in A_i[a_{i-1}]$  for all  $1 \leq i$ , thus,  $p = (a_i)_{i \geq 0} \in P$  and



$s_p(k) = a_m(k)$  for all  $k < 2n_m - 1$ . This implies that  $d(a_m, S) \leq d(a_m, s_p) \leq \frac{1}{2n_m} < \frac{1}{n_m}$ , so

$$(14) \quad A_m \subseteq B_{H_d} \left( S, \frac{1}{n_m} \right).$$

In conclusion, by (12), (14) we have that  $H_d(A_m, S) < \frac{1}{n_m}$ , thus,  $S \in \mathbf{V}_m$ , which implies that  $S \in \bigcap_{m < \omega} \mathbf{V}_m$ , and so  $\alpha$  wins.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.2.** *There exists a completely metrizable bounded metric space  $X$  with compatible metrics  $d, d'$  so that  $Ch(CL(X), H_d)$  is  $\alpha$ -favorable and  $Ch(CL(X), H_{d'})$  is  $\beta$ -favorable.*

#### REFERENCES

1. Aubin, J. P., *Applied abstract analysis*, Wiley, New York, 1977.
2. Castaing, C. and Valadier, M., *Convex analysis and measurable multifunctions*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
3. Banach, T. and Voytsitsky R., *Characterizing metric spaces whose hyperspaces are homeomorphic to  $\ell_2$* , *Colloq. Math.* **113** (2008), 223–229.
4. Beer, G., *Topologies on Closed and Closed Convex Sets*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993.
5. Beer, G., *A Polish topology for the closed subsets of a Polish space*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **113** (1991), 1123–1133.
6. Beer, G. and Di Maio, G., *Cofinal completeness of the Hausdorff metric topology*, *Fund. Math.* **208** (2010), 75–85.
7. Bennett, H. R., Lutzer D. J. and Reed, G. M., *Domain representability and the Choquet game in Moore and BCO-spaces*, *Topology Appl.* **155** (2008), 445–458.
8. Chaber J. and Pol, R., *Note on the Wijsman hyperspaces of completely metrizable spaces*, *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat.* (8) **5** (2002), 827–832.
9. Choquet, G., *Lectures on Analysis I.*, Benjamin, New York, 1969.
10. Costantini, C., *Every Wijsman topology relative to a Polish space is Polish*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **123** (1995), 2569–2574.
11. Costantini, C., *On the hyperspace of a non-separable metric space*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **126** (1998), 3393–3396.
12. Costantini, C., Levi, S. and Pelant, J., *Compactness and local compactness in hyperspaces*, *Topology Appl.* **123** (2002), 572–608.
13. Cao J. and Tomita, A. H., *The Wijsman hyperspace of a metric hereditarily Baire space is Baire*, *Topology Appl.* **157** (2010), 145–151.
14. Debs, G., *Espaces héréditairement de Baire*, *Fund. Math.* **129** (1988), 199–206.
15. Dorais, F. G. and Mummert, C., *Stationary and convergent strategies in Choquet games*, *Fund. Math.* **209** (2010), 59–79.
16. Effros, E. G., *Convergence of closed subsets in a topological space*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **16** (1965), 929–931.
17. Engelking, R., *General Topology*, Helderman, Berlin, 1989.
18. Haworth, R. C. and McCoy, R. A., *Baire spaces*, *Dissertationes Math.* **141** (1977), 1–77.
19. Kechris, A. S., *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Springer, New York, 1994.
20. Klein, E. and Thompson, A., *Theory of Correspondences*, Wiley, New York, 1975.
21. Kuratowski, K., *Topology I.*, Academic Press, New York, 1966.
22. Martin, K., *Topological games in domain theory*, *Topology Appl.* **129** (2003), 177–186.

23. Oxtoby, J.C., *The Banach-Mazur game and Banach Category Theorem*, in: Contributions to the theory of games, Vol. III, Annals of Math. Studies **39** (1957), 159–163.
24. Porada, E., *Jeu de Choquet*, Colloq. Math. **42** (1979), 345–353.
25. Telgársky, R., *Remarks on a game of Choquet*, Colloq. Math. **51** (1987), 365–372.
26. White, H. E., *Topological spaces that are  $\alpha$ -favorable for a player with perfect information*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **50**, (1975), 477–482.
27. Zsilinszky, L., *Polishness of the Wijsman topology revisited*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **126** (1998), 3763–3765.
28. Zsilinszky, L., *On  $\beta$ -favorability of the strong Choquet game*, Colloq. Math. **125** (2011), 233–243.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH  
CAROLINA AT PEMBROKE, PEMBROKE, NC 28372, USA

*E-mail address:* laszlo@uncp.edu