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#### Abstract

The author proposed a distance on $R^{n}$ in [1] which measures improvement of social welfare. Continuity of the distance with respect to the Euclidean metric of $R^{n}$ is proved in this note, and conversely, the Euclidean metric is continuous with respect to our distance on some subset of $R^{n}$.


## 1. Introduction

The author defined in [1] a distance on $R^{n}$ related to Lorenz dominance which is one of the important concepts of inequality of income distributions in the research of social welfare theory in economics (see, for example, [3]). The distance is defined as follows: for any two elements $x$ and $y$ of $R^{n}$, we define a kind of zero-sum two-person games and we assign the value $\delta(x, y)$ of the game to the two elements $x$ and $y$. The associated minimax equation of the game is

$$
\delta(x, y)=\max _{\lambda \in \Delta_{N}} \min _{\pi \in \Pi}\langle\lambda, \pi x-y\rangle=\min _{D \in \Delta_{\Pi}} \max _{i \in N}(x D-y)_{i} .
$$

The meaning of the notations in the minimax equation are as follows: We denote by $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ the standard Euclidean inner product of $R^{n}$, that is, $\langle\lambda, x\rangle=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} x_{i}$ for any elements $\lambda$ and $x$ of $R^{n}$. The set $N$ is all coordinates of elements of $R^{n}$, that is, $N=\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$ and $\Delta_{N}$ denotes the standard simplex of $R^{n}$, that is, $\Delta_{N}=\left\{\lambda \in R^{n}: \lambda_{i} \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}=1\right\}$. The set $\Pi$ denotes all permutations of $N$. For any permutation $\pi \in \Pi$ and any $x \in R^{n}$, define $\pi x=\left(x_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\pi(n)}\right)$. Thus, if $P$ is a permutation matrix corresponding to $\pi$, we have $\pi x=x P$. The set $\Delta_{\Pi}$ denotes the convex hull of the permutations and we can identify $\Delta_{\Pi}$ as the set of all doubly stochastic matrices by virtue of Birkohff's theorem([2, p. 19]). Thus we obtain a real-valued function $\delta$ on $R^{n} \times R^{n}$ where $\delta(x, y)$ is the value of the

[^0]game. We have shown in [1] that $\delta$ satisfies the triangle inequality, and finally we define our distance $d(x, y)$ between $x$ and $y$ as
$$
d(x, y)=\delta(x, y) \vee \delta(y, x) .
$$

The function $d$ is actually almost a distance on $R^{n}$. The word "almost" means $d$ satisfies all the axioms of distances except the axiom that $d(x, y)=0$ implies $x=y$. Our function $d$ satisfies only the property that $d(x, y)=0$ implies $x=\pi y$ for some permutation $\pi \in \Pi$.

Our purpose of this note is making clear topological relationship between our distance $d$ and the familiar Euclidean distance $d_{E}(x, y)=\sqrt{\langle x-y, x-y\rangle}=$ $\|x-y\|$.

The topology induced by our distance $d$ on $R^{n}$ is not Hausdorff because of the lack of the axiom that $d(x, y)=0$ implies $x=y$. We denote by $\tau$ the topology induced by our distance $d$, and by $\tau_{E}$ the topology induced by the Euclidean distance $d_{E}$.

## 2. Results

The following lemma is proved in [1], but it is a key lemma in this note and we show the proof here again. Let $M=\left\{\lambda \in R^{n}: \lambda_{1} \geq \lambda_{2} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{n} \geq 0\right\}$.

Lemma 1. For any two elements $x$ and $y$ of $R^{n}$, we have

$$
\delta(x, y)=\max _{\lambda \in M \cap \Delta_{N}}\left\langle\lambda, x^{*}-y^{*}\right\rangle,
$$

where $x^{*}$ denotes the increasing rearrangement of $x$, that is, $x^{*}=\pi x$ for some $\pi \in \Pi$ and the inequalities

$$
x_{\pi(1)} \leq x_{\pi(2)} \leq \cdots \leq x_{\pi(n)}
$$

hold.
Proof. Put $\beta=\max _{\lambda \in M \cap \Delta_{N}}\left\langle\lambda, x^{*}-y^{*}\right\rangle$. Firstly we show $\beta \leq \delta(x, y)$. Take $\lambda^{\prime} \in M \cap \Delta_{N}$ such that $\beta=\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, x^{*}-y^{*}\right\rangle=\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, x^{*}\right\rangle-\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, y^{*}\right\rangle$. Take $\pi^{\prime} \in \Pi$ such that $\pi^{\prime} y^{*}=y$, then we have $\beta=\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, x^{*}\right\rangle-\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y\right\rangle$. Since $\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, \pi x\right\rangle \geq\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, x^{*}\right\rangle$ for all $\pi \in \Pi$ ([2, p. 141]), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta & \leq\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, \pi x\right\rangle-\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y\right\rangle \\
& =\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime},\left(\pi^{\prime} \circ \pi\right) x\right\rangle-\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y\right\rangle \\
& =\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime},\left(\pi^{\prime} \circ \pi\right) x-y\right\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we have $\beta \leq \min _{\pi \in \Pi}\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime},\left(\pi^{\prime} \circ \pi\right) x-y\right\rangle$ because $\pi$ is arbitrary, and hence $\beta \leq \min _{\pi \in \Pi}\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, \pi x-y\right\rangle$. Since $\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} \in \Delta_{N}$, we have

$$
\beta \leq \max _{\lambda \in \Delta_{N}} \min _{\pi \in \Pi}\langle\lambda, \pi x-y\rangle=\delta(x, y)
$$

Next we show the reverse inequality $\delta(x, y) \leq \beta$. Take $\lambda^{\prime} \in \Delta_{N}$ such that $\delta(x, y)=\min _{\pi \in \Pi}\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, \pi x-y\right\rangle=\min _{\pi \in \Pi}\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, \pi x\right\rangle-\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, y\right\rangle$. Take $\pi^{\prime} \in \Pi$ such that $\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}$ belongs to $M$, then $\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y^{*}\right\rangle \leq\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, y\right\rangle$, and hence we have $\delta(x, y) \leq$ $\min _{\pi \in \Pi}\left\langle\lambda^{\prime}, \pi x\right\rangle-\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y^{*}\right\rangle$. Let $\pi^{\prime \prime} \in \Pi$ be the permutation such that $\pi^{\prime \prime} x^{*}=x$. Then we have the following series of inequalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta(x, y) & \leq \min _{\pi \in \Pi}\left\langle\lambda^{\prime},\left(\pi \circ \pi^{\prime \prime}\right) x^{*}\right\rangle-\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y^{*}\right\rangle \\
& =\min _{\pi \in \Pi}\left\langle\left(\pi \circ \pi^{\prime \prime}\right)^{-1} \lambda^{\prime}, x^{*}\right\rangle-\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y^{*}\right\rangle \\
& \leq\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, x^{*}\right\rangle-\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, y^{*}\right\rangle \\
& =\left\langle\pi^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime}, x^{*}-y^{*}\right\rangle \\
& \leq \max _{\lambda \in M \cap \Delta_{N}}\left\langle\lambda, x^{*}-y^{*}\right\rangle \\
& =\beta
\end{aligned}
$$

Firstly, we show the continuity of our distance $d$ with respect to $\tau_{E}$.
Proposition 1. The distance $d: R^{n} \times R^{n} \rightarrow R$ is continuous when $R^{n}$ is equipped with $\tau_{E}$.

Proof. At first, we show the continuity of the mapping $x \mapsto x^{*}$ with respect to $\tau_{E}$. Take a sequence $\left\{x_{m}\right\}$ and an element $x$ such that $d_{E}\left(x_{m}, x\right)$ converges to 0 . Take a permutation matrix $P$ with $x^{*}=x P$. If $x^{*}$ has components with the same value, then they appear contiguously and let the sets of the contiguous indices be $E_{1}, \ldots, E_{p}$ and the sets be ordered such that if $i \in E_{k}, j \in E_{l}$ and $k<l$, then $x_{i}^{*}<x_{j}^{*}$. Put $x_{m}^{\prime}=x_{m} P$. Then $x_{m}^{\prime}$ converges to $x^{*}$. On the other hand, fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon>0$. For sufficiently large $m$, for all $i \notin \cup_{k=1}^{p} E_{k}$, we have $x_{m i}^{\prime}=x_{m i}^{*}$. Thus we have $\left|x_{m i}^{*}-x_{i}^{*}\right|=\left|x_{m i}^{\prime}-x_{i}^{*}\right|<\varepsilon$. Next, fix a $k$ and consider the set $E_{k}$. For any $i \in E_{k}$, there is $j \in E_{k}$ such that $\left|x_{i}^{*}-x_{m i}^{*}\right|=\left|x_{j}^{*}-x_{m j}^{\prime}\right|<\varepsilon$ for sufficiently large $m$. Thus, it follows that $d_{E}\left(x_{m}^{*}, x^{*}\right)$ converges to 0 .

It is sufficient to show the continuity of $\delta$ with respect to $\tau_{E}$. By Lemma 1 , we have $\delta(x, y)=\max _{\lambda \in M \cap \Delta_{N}}\left\langle\lambda, x^{*}-y^{*}\right\rangle$. Since we have shown the continuity of the map $x \mapsto x^{*}$, it is sufficient to prove the function defined by $f(x)=$ $\max _{\lambda \in M \cap \Delta_{N}}\langle\lambda, x\rangle$ is continuous with respect to $\tau_{E}$. By the definition of $f$, it is lower semicontinuous, and hence we need to show it is upper semicontinuous. Suppose a sequence $\left\{x_{m}\right\}$ converges to an element $x$ in $\tau_{E}$, and fix $\varepsilon>0$ arbitrarily.

Take $\lambda_{m} \in M \cap \Delta_{N}$ with $f\left(x_{m}\right)=\left\langle\lambda_{m}, x_{m}\right\rangle$. Since $\lambda_{m} \in M \cap \Delta_{N}$, we have $\left\|\lambda_{m}\right\| \leq 1$. Thus we have $\left\langle\lambda_{m}, x_{m}\right\rangle-\left\langle\lambda_{m}, x\right\rangle \leq\left\|\lambda_{m}\right\|\left\|x_{m}-x\right\| \leq\left\|x_{m}-x\right\|$. Therefore, for sufficiently large $m$, we have

$$
f\left(x_{m}\right)=\left\langle\lambda_{m}, x_{m}\right\rangle<\left\langle\lambda_{m}, x\right\rangle+\varepsilon \leq f(x)+\varepsilon,
$$

which means $f$ is upper semicontinuous at $x$ with respect to $\tau_{E}$.
Next we investigate the continuity of $d_{E}$ with respect to $\tau$. For almost all $x \in R^{n}, d_{E}(x, \pi x)>0$ holds if $\pi$ is not the identity mapping, but we have $d(x, \pi x)=0$ for all permutations $\pi$. Thus $d_{E}$ is not continuous with respect to $\tau$ on $R^{n}$. However, if we restrict the space $R^{n}$ to the subspace

$$
M=\left\{x \in R^{n}: x_{1} \geq x_{2} \geq \cdots \geq x_{n} \geq 0\right\}
$$

then the situation changes. Note that $d$ becomes accurately a distance on the set $M$.
Proposition 2. The distance $d_{E}: M \times M \rightarrow R$ is continuous when the set $M$ is equipped with $\tau$.

Proof. Suppose a sequence $\left\{x_{m}\right\}$ in $M$ converges to an element $x$ in $M$ with respect to $\tau$. Since $d(x, y)=\delta(x, y) \vee \delta(y, x)$, for any $\lambda \in M \cap \Delta_{N},\left\langle\lambda, x_{m}^{*}\right\rangle$ converges to $\left\langle\lambda, x^{*}\right\rangle$. For each $i=1, \ldots, n$, let $e_{i}$ be the element of $R^{n}$ whose components are all 0 except for the $i$ th component whose value is 1 . If we take $\lambda=e_{1}$, then we have $x_{m 1}^{*}$ converges to $x_{1}^{*}$. If we take $\lambda=\left(e_{1}+e_{2}\right) / 2$, then we have $\left(x_{m 1}^{*}+x_{m 2}^{*}\right) / 2$ converges to $\left(x_{1}^{*}+x_{2}^{*}\right) / 2$. Since $x_{m 1}^{*}$ converges to $x_{1}^{*}$, it is easily seen $x_{m 2}^{*}$ converges to $x_{2}^{*}$. Similarly we have $x_{m i}^{*}$ converges to $x_{i}^{*}$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$. This means $d_{E}\left(x_{m}, x\right)$ converges to 0 . Since any distance is continuous with respect to the topology induced by the distance, it follows that $d_{E}$ is continuous with respect to $\tau$ on $M$.

Combining Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, we have the following corollary.
Corollary 1. The distances $d$ and $d_{E}$ are topologically equivalent on the set M.
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