Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis Journal of the Juliusz Schauder Center Volume 33, 2009, 307–313

# RETRACTING BALL ONTO SPHERE IN $BC_0(\mathbb{R})$

Łukasz Piasecki

ABSTRACT. In infinite dimensional Banach spaces the unit sphere is a lip-schitzian retract of the unit ball. We use the space of continuous functions vanishing at a point to provide an example of such retraction having relatively small Lipschitz constant.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $(X, \|\|)$  be an infinite dimensional Banach space with the unit ball B and the unit sphere S. Since the works of Nowak [8] and Benyamini and Sternfeld [2] it is known that S is a lipschitzian retract of B. It means that there exists a mapping (a retraction)  $R: B \to S$  satisfying, with a certain constant k > 0, the Lipschitz condition

for all  $x, y \in B$  and such that Rx = x for all  $x \in S$ . Obviously, the above is not true for spaces of finite dimension due to the Brouwer's Non Retraction Theorem. There is an interesting question. What is the infimum of all k admitting existence of a retraction  $R: B \to S$  satisfying the Lipschitz condition (1.1) with constant k?

 $<sup>2000\</sup> Mathematics\ Subject\ Classification.\ Primary\ 47H10.$ 

Key words and phrases. Minimal displacement, optimal retractions, lipschitzian mappings. This paper is a part of the L. Piasecki master's degree thesis, which won an award of the Polish Mathematical Society Competition in honour of Józef Marcinkiewicz (1910–1940, Starobielsk [Katyń extermination]).

308 Ł. Piasecki

More precisely, the investigation is going on to find or evaluate the *optimal* retraction constant  $k_0(X)$  defined by:

$$k_0(X) = \inf\{k : \text{ there exists a retraction } R: B \to S \text{ satisfying } (1.1)\}.$$

At present the exact value of  $k_0(X)$  is not known for any single Banach space. Various evaluations can be found in books of Goebel and Kirk [4] and Goebel [3] and papers cited there. Obviously, constant  $k_0(X)$  can not be to small. The universal known bound from below is  $k_0(X) \geq 3$  but probably it is not sharp. For some spaces there are better estimates e.g.  $k_0(X) > 3$  for uniformly convex spaces,  $k_0(l_1) \geq 4$  and  $k_0(H) > 4.5$  for Hilbert space. There were several approaches to give a reasonable universal estimate from above. All of them are based on individual constructions and tricks. It is a general feeling that spaces can differ by the value of  $k_0(X)$  depending on the regularity of the norm geometry.

For several years the best known estimate from above was for  $L_1(0,1)$  (see [3]). Together with a general estimation from below, we have

$$3 \le k_0(L_1(0,1)) \le 9.43...$$

Very recently M. Annoni and E. Casini [1] obtained better evaluation for  $l_1$ . Together with known bound from below, we have

$$4 \le k_0(l_1) \le 8$$
.

Immediately, the same estimate has been extended for  $L_1(0,1)$  and few other spaces [6].

An interesting situation is observed for spaces with uniform norm. The best known estimate for the space of continuous functions is (see [3])

$$3 < k_0(C[0,1]) < 4(1+\sqrt{2})^2 = 23.31...$$

Added in the proof: Author get a better estimation:  $k_0(C[0,1]) < 14.93$  in his master's degree thesis. But for subspace  $C_0[0,1]$  consisting of all the functions vanishing at zero the best published estimate is (see [5])

$$3 \le k_0(C_0[0,1]) \le 12.$$

This was improved by the very recent result [7] stating that

$$3 \le k_0(C_0[0,1]) \le 7.$$

The aim of this note is to present a construction for the space  $BC_0(\mathbb{R})$  of all bounded continuous functions vanishing at zero which improves the estimates presented above. Then we extend this construction to a much wider class of spaces.

## **2.** The case of $BC_0(\mathbb{R})$

Let us start with the space  $BC_0(\mathbb{R})$  of all bounded continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  vanishing at zero and furnished with the standard uniform norm  $||f|| = \sup\{|f(t)| : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . For our construction we shall need two simple special functions. First function is  $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \to [-1, 1]$ ,

$$\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{for } t < -1, \\ t & \text{for } -1 \le t \le 1, \\ 1 & \text{for } t > 1. \end{cases}$$

Function  $\alpha$  generates the truncation retraction Q of the whole space  $BC_0(\mathbb{R})$  onto its unit ball B,

$$Qf(t) = \alpha(f(t)) = \max\{-1, \min\{1, f(t)\}\}.$$

Obviously Q satisfies the Lipschitz condition (1.1) with the constant k=1

$$(2.1) ||Qf - Qg|| \le ||f - g||$$

and for each f such that ||f|| > 1 we have

$$(2.2) ||Qf|| = 1.$$

Also for any  $r \geq 0$  it generates the truncation  $Q_r$  on the ball B(r) with center at zero and radius r,

$$Q_r f = \begin{cases} rQ((1/r)f) & \text{if } r > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } r = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for any  $r_1 \geq 0, r_2 \geq 0$ , we have

$$(2.3)  $||Q_{r_1}f - Q_{r_2}g|| \le \max\{|r_1 - r_2|, ||f - g||\}.$$$

The second simple function to be used in the construction is  $\Lambda: [0, \infty) \to [0, 1]$ 

$$\Lambda(t) = \begin{cases} 3t & \text{for } 0 \le t \le 1/3, \\ 2 - 3t & \text{for } 1/3 < t \le 2/3, \\ 0 & \text{for } t > 2/3. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that  $\Lambda$  satisfies for all  $s,t\in[0,\infty)$  the Lipschitz condition

$$(2.4) |\Lambda(s) - \Lambda(t)| < 3|s - t|.$$

The function  $\Lambda$  can be used to define a mapping  $T: BC_0(\mathbb{R}) \to B$  by putting for each  $f \in BC_0(\mathbb{R})$ 

(2.5) 
$$Tf(t) = \Lambda\left(|f(t)| + \frac{|t|}{1+|t|}\right).$$

310 Ł. Piasecki

In view of (2.4), for all  $f, g \in BC_0(\mathbb{R})$  we have

$$(2.6) ||Tf - Tg|| \le 3||f - g||.$$

Moreover, for each  $f \in BC_0(\mathbb{R})$  there exists a point  $t_1$  such that

$$|f(t_1)| + \frac{|t_1|}{1 + |t_1|} = \frac{1}{3}$$
 and  $Tf(t_1) = 1$ .

Hence

$$(2.7) ||f - Tf|| \ge |Tf(t_1)| - |f(t_1)| = 1 - \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{|t_1|}{1 + |t_1|}\right) = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{|t_1|}{1 + |t_1|} \ge \frac{2}{3}.$$

In the next step let us define a mapping  $F: B((2+\sqrt{2})/3) \to BC_0(\mathbb{R})$ 

$$Ff = \begin{cases} f - Tf & \text{if } ||f|| \le 2/3, \\ f - Q_{3(1-||f||)}Tf & \text{if } 2/3 \le ||f|| \le 1, \\ (4 - 3||f||)f & \text{if } 1 \le ||f|| \le (2 + \sqrt{2})/3. \end{cases}$$

The radius  $(2 + \sqrt{2})/3$  has been selected via certain process of optimization. We skip the detailes.

Observe that if ||f|| = 2/3 both formulas give the same result. The same holds if ||f|| = 1.

Let us prove that mapping F satisfies the Lipschitz condition with constant 4.

- In view of (2.6) for all f, g with  $||f|| \le 2/3$  and  $||g|| \le 2/3$  we have  $||Ff Fg|| = ||(f Tf) (g Tg)|| \le ||f g|| + ||Tf Tg||$  $\le ||f g|| + 3||f g|| = 4||f g||;$
- • In view of (2.3) and (2.6) for all  $f,\ g$  with  $2/3 \le \|f\| \le 1$  and  $2/3 \le \|g\| \le 1$  we have

$$\begin{split} \|Ff - Fg\| &= \|(f - Q_{3(1-\|f\|)}Tf) - (g - Q_{3(1-\|g\|)}Tg)\| \\ &\leq \|f - g\| + \|Q_{3(1-\|f\|)}Tf - Q_{3(1-\|g\|)}Tg\| \\ &\leq \|f - g\| + \max\{|3(1-\|f\|) - 3(1-\|g\|)|, \|Tf - Tg\|\} \\ &\leq \|f - g\| + \max\{3\|\|f\| - \|g\||, 3\|f - g\|\} = 4\|f - g\|; \end{split}$$

• Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $1 \le ||g|| \le ||f|| \le (2+\sqrt{2})/3$ ,

$$\begin{split} \|Ff - Fg\| &= \|(4 - 3\|f\|)f - (4 - 3\|g\|)g\| \\ &\leq \|(4 - 3\|f\|)(f - g)\| + \|(4 - 3\|f\|)g - (4 - 3\|g\|)g\| \\ &\leq (4 - 3\|f\|)\|f - g\| + 3\|g\|(\|f\| - \|g\|) \\ &\leq (4 - 3\|f\| + 3\|g\|)\|f - g\| \leq 4\|f - g\|. \end{split}$$

Finally, the standard reasoning shows that for all  $f,g\in B((2+\sqrt{2})/3)$  we have

$$||Ff - Fg|| \le 4||f - g||.$$

Let us prove now that for each  $f \in B((2+\sqrt{2})/3)$  we have

In view of (2.7),  $||Ff|| = ||f - Tf|| \ge 2/3$  for all f with  $||f|| \le 2/3$ . The same holds for all f with  $2/3 \le ||f|| \le 1$ . Indeed, if f attains its norm at a point  $\bar{t}$ ,  $||f|| = |f(\bar{t})| \ge 2/3$ , then using the fact that  $\Lambda(|f(\bar{t})| + |\bar{t}|/(1 + |\bar{t}|)) = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{split} \|Ff\| &= \|f - Q_{3(1-\|f\|)}Tf\| \ge |f(\bar{t}) - Q_{3(1-\|f\|)}Tf(\bar{t})| \\ &\ge |f(\bar{t})| - \left|Q_{3(1-\|f\|)}\Lambda\bigg(|f(\bar{t})| + \frac{|\bar{t}|}{1+|\bar{t}|}\bigg)\right| = \|f\| \ge \frac{2}{3}. \end{split}$$

Since functions attaining their norm form the dense set in B we conclude that

$$||Ff|| \ge \frac{2}{3}$$
 for each  $f \in B$ .

If  $1 \le ||f|| \le (2 + \sqrt{2})/3$  then

$$||Ff|| = ||(4-3||f||)f|| = (4-3||f||)||f|| \ge \frac{2}{3},$$

and inequality (2.9) is proved.

Observe also that for each f with  $||f|| = \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{3}$  we have

$$(2.10) Ff = (2 - \sqrt{2})f.$$

Let us define now a mapping  $\widetilde{F}: B \to BC_0(\mathbb{R})$  by putting for each  $f \in B$ 

$$\widetilde{F}f = \frac{3}{2+\sqrt{2}}F\left(\frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{3}f\right)$$

In view of (2.8)-(2.10)

• for all  $f, g \in B$  we have

(2.11) 
$$\|\widetilde{F}f - \widetilde{F}g\| \le 4\|f - g\|;$$

• for each  $f \in B$  we have

$$\|\widetilde{F}f\| \ge \frac{2}{2+\sqrt{2}};$$

• for each  $f \in S$  we have

$$\widetilde{F}f = \frac{2}{2 + \sqrt{2}}f.$$

312 Ł. Piasecki

Putting together (2.1), (2.2), (2.11)–(2.13) we can now define the retraction  $R: B \to S$  as

$$Rf = Q\left(\frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{2}\widetilde{F}f\right)$$

and observe that for all  $f, g \in B$  we have

$$\begin{split} \|Rf-Rg\| &= \left\|Q\left(\frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{2}\widetilde{F}f\right) - Q\left(\frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{2}\widetilde{F}g\right)\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{2}\|\widetilde{F}f-\widetilde{F}g\| \leq 4\left(\frac{2+\sqrt{2}}{2}\right)\|f-g\| = 2(2+\sqrt{2})\|f-g\|. \end{split}$$

What we have shown can be formulated as

$$k_0(BC_0(\mathbb{R})) \le 2(2+\sqrt{2}) < 6.83.$$

## 3. Possibility of generalization

Presented construction can be repeated with minor changes and applied to a much wider class of spaces. Suppose (M,d) is a connected metric space consisting of more than one point and let  $z \in M$  be a selected point. Consider the space  $BC_z(M)$  of all bounded continuous functions  $f: M \to \mathbb{R}$  vanishing at z, f(z) = 0, with the standard uniform norm  $||f|| = \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in M\}$ .

If M is an unbounded then the following modification of the formula (2.5),

$$Tf(x) = \Lambda \left( |f(x)| + \frac{d(x,z)}{1 + d(x,z)} \right)$$

allows to carry on the proof with only technical changes.

For bounded space M, the same holds. It is enough to put

$$m = \sup\{d(x, z) : x \in M\}$$

and modify (2.5) by

$$Tf(x) = \Lambda\left(|f(x)| + \frac{d(x,z)}{m}\right).$$

All the above allows us to conclude with the theorem,

THEOREM 3.1. If (M,d) is a connected metric space consisting of more than one point and  $z \in M$  is a given point, then

$$k_0(BC_z(M)) \le 2(2+\sqrt{2}) < 6.83.$$

The above proof combined tricks known from [5] and [7].

### References

- [1] M. Annoni and E. Casini, An upper bound for the Lipschitz retraction constant in  $l_1$ , Studia Math. 180 (2007), 73–76.
- [2] Y. BENYAMINI AND Y. STERNFELD, Spheres in infinite dimensional Banach space are Lipschitz contractible, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 88 (1983), 439–445.
- [3] K. Goebel, Concise Course on Fixed Point Theorems, Yokohama Publishers, 2002.
- [4] K. Goebel and W. A. Kirk, Topics in metric fixed point theory (1990), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [5] K. Goebel and G. Marino, A note on minimal displacement and optimal retraction problems, Fixed Point Theory and its Applications, Guanajuato Mexico 2005, Yokohama Publishers, 2006.
- [6] K. Goebel, G. Marino, L. Muglia and R. Volpe, Valuation of retraction constant and minimal displacement in some Banach spaces, Nonlinear Anal. (to appear).
- [7] K. Goebel and L. Piasecki, A new estimate for the optimal retraction constant, International Symposium on Banach and Function Spaces, Proceedings of the conference, Kitakiushiu 2006, Yokohama Publishers.
- [8] B. NOWAK, On the Lipschitz retraction of the unit ball in infinite dimensional Banach spaces onto boundary, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. 27 (1979), 861–864.

Manuscript received November 26, 2007

ŁUKASZ PIASECKI Institute of Mathematics Maria Curie-Skłodowska University 20-031 Lublin, POLAND

E-mail address: piasecki@hektor.umcs.lublin.pl