

ON AN EQUIVALENT NORM IN L_1
WHICH IS UNIFORMLY CONVEX IN EVERY DIRECTION

Denka N. Kutzarova

1. Introduction. A norm on a Banach space X is said to be uniformly convex in every direction (UCED) if the conditions $x_n, y_n, z \in X, \|x_n\| \rightarrow 1, \|y_n\| \rightarrow 1, \|x_n + y_n\| \rightarrow 2$ and $x_n - y_n = \lambda_n z$ imply $\|x_n - y_n\| \rightarrow 0$.

A norm on a Banach space X is locally uniformly rotund (LUR) if the conditions $x, x_n \in X, \|x\| = 1, \|x_n\| \rightarrow 1, \|x + x_n\| \rightarrow 2$ imply $\|x - x_n\| \rightarrow 0$.

Using the construction of an equivalent LUR norm in [1], it is obtained in [3] that every $L_1(S, \Sigma, \mu)$ admits an equivalent norm which is UCED.

The following statement is proved in [2]. Let Y be a LUR Banach space with B_Y its unit ball and X be a Banach space, $F \subset X^*$, F be norming on X . Let $T: Y \rightarrow X$ be a bounded linear operator with $T(Y)$ norm dense in X and $T(B_Y)$ be $\sigma(X, F)$ compact. Then X admits an equivalent $\sigma(X, F)$ lower semicontinuous norm which is LUR.

A counter - example shows that it is not possible to obtain a similar general statement for norms which are UCED. In spite of this, using the construction in [2], we may give a rather simpler proof of the main result in [3] that L_1 can be UCED - renormed.

2. Let (S, Σ, μ) be a probability measure, $X = L_1(S, \Sigma, \mu)$ and $U = L_2(S, \Sigma, \mu)$ with their usual norms $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ respectively. Denote by B_2 the closed unit ball of U . Let T be the identity mapping of U into X . TB_2 is weakly compact and TU is norm dense in X . Following [2], define for $x \in X$

$$\Psi(x) = \|x\|_1^2 + \sum_{p, q \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-(p+q)} \varrho^2(x, \frac{p}{q} K),$$

where $K = TB_2$ and $\varrho(x, Q) = \inf \{\|x - y\|_1 : y \in Q\}, Q \subset X$.

The Minkowski functional of the set $\{x \in X : \Psi(x) \leq 1\}$ is an equivalent norm on X . Denote it by $\|\cdot\|$.

Theorem 2.1. The norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $X = L_1(S, \Sigma, \mu)$ is UCED.

Since K is w -compact, then for every $x \in X$ there exists a nearest point to x in αK , $\alpha > 0$, and by strict convexity of B_2 , this point is unique. If $\varphi(x, \alpha K) > 0$, it follows from $u \in \alpha B_2$, $\|x - Tu\|_1 = \varphi(x, \alpha K)$ that $\|u\|_2 = \alpha$. Clearly, $\varphi(x, \alpha K)$ is a Lipschitz function with constant 1 on $\{\alpha \geq 0\}$ for fixed $x \in X$. It is easy to prove the following assertion.

Lemma 2.2. Let $x, y \in X$, $\varphi(x, \alpha K) > 0$, $u \in U$, $\|u\|_2 = \alpha$, $\|x - Tu\|_1 = \varphi(x, \alpha K)$ and $y = Tu + \lambda(x - Tu)$, $\lambda \geq 0$. Then,

$$\|y - Tu\|_1 = \varphi(y, \alpha K).$$

Let now $x_n, y_n \in X$, $\|x_n\| \rightarrow 1$, $\|y_n\| \rightarrow 1$, $\|x_n + y_n\| \rightarrow 2$. By convexity argument (see [2]), for every $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(1) \quad \lim_n [\varphi(x_n, \frac{p}{q}K) - \varphi(y_n, \frac{p}{q}K)] = 0.$$

Similarly,

$$(2) \quad \lim_n [\varphi(x_n, \frac{p}{q}K) - \varphi(\frac{1}{2}(x_n + y_n), \frac{p}{q}K)] = 0.$$

Consider $\varphi(x_n, \alpha K)$ as a sequence of functions on $\{\alpha \geq 0\}$. Since these functions are decreasing and uniformly bounded, then there exists a subsequence $\{n\}$ such that $\varphi(x_n, \alpha K) \rightarrow d(\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \geq 0$. Since $\varphi(x_n, \alpha K)$ are Lip - 1, then $d(\alpha)$ is also Lip - 1 and in particular, $d(\alpha)$ is continuous. Analogously, choose a new subsequence $\{n\}$ such that $\varphi(y_n, \alpha K) \rightarrow d_1(\alpha)$ with $d_1(\alpha)$ continuous. Hence, (1) and the continuity of $d(\alpha)$ and $d_1(\alpha)$ imply $d_1(\alpha) = d(\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \geq 0$. Similarly, by (2), it is no loss of generality to assume that for a subsequence $\{n\}$ we have also $\varphi((x_n + y_n)/2, \alpha K) \rightarrow d(\alpha)$, $\alpha \geq 0$, i.e.

$$(3) \quad \varphi(x_n, \alpha K), \varphi(y_n, \alpha K), \varphi((x_n + y_n)/2, \alpha K) \rightarrow d(\alpha), \alpha \geq 0.$$

In the following assertion a modification of the technique in [2] is used.

Lemma 2.3. Let $x_n, y_n \in X$ satisfy (3). Let $0 \leq \alpha < r$, $\delta = d(\alpha) > d(r)$ and $u_n, v_n \in \alpha B_2$, $\|x_n - Tu_n\|_1 = \varphi(x_n, \alpha K)$, $\|y_n - Tv_n\|_1 = \varphi(y_n, \alpha K)$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{n\}$ so that $\|u_n - v_n\|_2 \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Let B be the closed unit ball of $(X, \|\cdot\|_1)$. Denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the equivalent norm on X , induced by $K_1 = \alpha K + \delta B$.

Choose on the half lines $[Tu_n, x_n)$ and $[Tv_n, y_n)$ points

x'_n and y'_n , respectively, so that $\|x'_n - Tu_n\|_1 = \delta, \|y'_n - Tv_n\|_1 = \delta$.

Since $\delta > 0$, Lemma 2.2 implies $\|x'_n - Tu_n\|_1 = \varrho(x'_n, \mathcal{A}K)$,

$\|y'_n - Tv_n\|_1 = \varrho(y'_n, \mathcal{A}K)$ for n large enough, i.e.

$$(4) \quad \varrho(x'_n, \mathcal{A}K) = \delta, \quad \varrho(y'_n, \mathcal{A}K) = \delta.$$

By (3) and the form of x'_n and y'_n we have that $\|x'_n - x_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0$, $\|y'_n - y_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0$. By this and (3) we obtain $\varrho((x'_n + y'_n)/2, \mathcal{A}K) \rightarrow \delta$. This and (4) give

$$(5) \quad \|x'_n\| = 1, \quad \|y'_n\| = 1, \quad \|(x'_n + y'_n)/2\| \rightarrow 1.$$

Let $f_n \in X^*$ be such that $\|f_n\| = 1$ and

$$(6) \quad f_n(x'_n + y'_n) = \|x'_n + y'_n\|.$$

Therefore, (5) and (6) imply

$$(7) \quad f_n(x'_n) \rightarrow 1, \quad f_n(y'_n) \rightarrow 1.$$

Put $w_n = x'_n - Tu_n$. By $\|f_n\| = 1$ and (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_n \left(\sup_{K_1} f_n - f_n(Tu_n + w_n) \right) \\ = \lim_n \left(\sup_{\mathcal{A}K} f_n - f_n(Tu_n) \right) + \lim_n \left(\sup_{\delta B} f_n - f_n(w_n) \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since both summands are non-negative, it follows that

$$(8) \quad \lim_n \left(\sup_{\mathcal{A}K} f_n - f_n(Tu_n) \right) = 0.$$

Similarly,

$$(9) \quad \lim_n \left(\sup_{\mathcal{A}K} f_n - f_n(Tv_n) \right) = 0.$$

We shall show that $\liminf_n \left(\sup_{\mathcal{A}K} f_n \right) > 0$. It follows from $B_\delta \subset K_1$

and $\|f_n\| = 1$ that

$$(10) \quad \sup \left(f_n(x) : \|x\|_1 \leq 1 \right) \leq 1/\delta.$$

We conclude from $\|x'_n - x_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|y'_n - y_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ that $x'_n, y'_n, (x'_n + y'_n)/2$ satisfy (3). Hence, by $\varrho(x'_n, rK) \rightarrow d(r)$, there exist

$z_n \in rK$ so that $\|x'_n - z_n\|_1 < \delta - 2\delta_1$ for n sufficiently large,

where $\delta_1 = (\delta - d(r))/3 > 0$. This, (7) and (10) give for n

sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{rK} f_n &\geq |f_n(z_n)| \geq |f_n(x'_n)| - |f_n(z_n - x'_n)| \\ &\geq |f_n(x'_n)| - (\delta - 2\delta_1)/\delta > \delta_1/\delta > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists a subsequence $\{n\}$ such that

$$(11) \quad \lim_n \left(\sup_{\mathcal{L}_K} f_n \right) = t > 0.$$

Define $h_n, h'_n \in U^*$, $h'_n(u) = f_n(Tu)$, $h_n = h'_n / \|h'_n\|_2$.

It follows from (8), (9) and (11) that $f_n(Tu_n) \rightarrow t$, $f_n(Tv_n) \rightarrow t$.

Moreover, by (11), $\|h'_n\|_2 \rightarrow t/\alpha$. Thus, $h_n(u_n) \rightarrow \alpha$, $h_n(v_n) \rightarrow \alpha$.

Consequently,

$$\liminf_n \|u_n + v_n\|_2 = \liminf_n h_n(u_n + v_n) = 2\alpha.$$

By this, $\|u_n\|_2 = \|v_n\|_2 = \alpha$ and the uniform convexity of U , we obtain that

$$\|u_n - v_n\|_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

2.4. Proof of Theorem 2.1. It suffices to show that the conditions $x_n, y_n, z \in X$, $\|x_n\| \rightarrow 1$, $\|y_n\| \rightarrow 1$, $\|x_n + y_n\| \rightarrow 2$,

$x_n - y_n = z$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ imply $z = 0$.

Choose a subsequence $\{n\}$ to satisfy (3). Assume that $z \neq 0$. Put $\|z\|_1 = \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists an $\eta > 0$ so that $\mu(C) < \eta$ implies $\|z\chi_C\|_1 < \varepsilon/2$. Denote

$$C_n = \{|x_n| > 3/\eta\} \cup \{|y_n| > 3/\eta\}.$$

Thus, $\limsup_n \mu(C_n) < \eta$, whence $\mu(C_n) < \eta$ for n

sufficiently large. Put $A_n = S \setminus C_n$. Therefore, $\|z\chi_{A_n}\|_1 > \varepsilon/2$, i.e.

$$(12) \quad \| (x_n - y_n)\chi_{A_n} \|_1 > \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{for } n \text{ sufficiently large}$$

By this, there exists a subsequence $\{n\}$ such that either for $\{x_n\}$ or for $\{y_n\}$ - say for $\{x_n\}$, the inequalities $\|x_n\chi_{A_n}\|_1 \geq \varepsilon/4$

hold. It follows from $|x_n\chi_{A_n}| \leq 3/\eta$ that $\|x_n\chi_{A_n}\|_2 \leq 3/\eta$.

We have

$$\|x_n\|_1 = \|x_n - x_n\chi_{A_n}\|_1 + \|x_n\chi_{A_n}\|_1 \geq \rho(x_n, 3\eta^{-1}K) + \varepsilon/4.$$

Therefore, $d(0) \geq d(3/\eta) + \varepsilon/4$, whence

$$(13) \quad d(0) > \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} d(\alpha) = d.$$

Since $d(\alpha)$ is continuous and decreasing, according to (13), we may select α and r such that $0 < \alpha < r$ and

$$d + \varepsilon/6 > d(\alpha) > d(r).$$

Let $u_n, v_n \in \mathcal{L}B_2$, $\|x_n - Tu_n\|_1 = \rho(x_n, \alpha K)$ and $\|y_n - Tv_n\|_1 = \rho(y_n, \alpha K)$.

Then, it follows from Lemma 2.3 that there exists a subsequence $\{n\}$ so that $\|u_n - v_n\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, whence

$$(14) \quad \|Tu_n - Tv_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0.$$

We have that

$$\|x_n - Tu_n\|_1 = \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{C_n}\|_1 + \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1.$$

Moreover,

$$(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{C_n} = x_n - (x_n\chi_{A_n} + Tu_n\chi_{C_n}) = x_n - T(x_n\chi_{A_n} + u_n\chi_{C_n})$$

and $\|x_n\chi_{A_n} + u_n\chi_{C_n}\|_2 \leq 3/\eta + \alpha = \eta_1$. Then,

$$d \leq d(\eta_1) \leftarrow \mathcal{G}(x_n, \eta_1 K) \leq \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{C_n}\|_1$$

$$= \|x_n - Tu_n\|_1 - \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1 = \mathcal{G}(x_n, \alpha K) - \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1.$$

Therefore,

$$d \leq d(\alpha) - \liminf_n \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1 < d + \varepsilon/6 - \liminf_n \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1,$$

i.e.

$$\liminf_n \|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1 < \varepsilon/6.$$

Select a subsequence $\{n\}$ so that

$$\|(x_n - Tu_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1 < \varepsilon/6.$$

Similarly, we may choose a new subsequence $\{n\}$ such that

$$\|(y_n - Tv_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1 < \varepsilon/6.$$

It follows from (14) that $\|Tu_n - Tv_n\|_1 < \varepsilon/6$ for n sufficiently large. Then,

$$\|(x_n - y_n)\chi_{A_n}\|_1 < \varepsilon/2,$$

which contradicts (12). Hence, $z = 0$, which completes the proof.

References

1. W.Davis, N.Ghoussoub and J.Lindenstrauss. A lattice renorming theorem and applications to vector-valued processes. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 263, 1981, 531 - 540.
2. G.Godefroy, S.Troyanski, J.H.M.Whitfield, V.Zizler. Smoothness in Weakly Compactly Generated Banach spaces. J.Funct. Analysis, 52, 1983, 344 - 352.
3. D.N.Kutzarova and S.L.Troyanski. On equivalent lattice norms which are uniformly convex or uniformly differentiable in every direction in Banach lattices with a weak unit. Serdica, 9, 1983, 249 - 262.

Institute of Mathematics with Computer Center
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
P.O.Box 373 1090 Sofia Bulgaria