

Strictly convex norms and topology

Richard Smith¹ (with José Orihuela and Stanimir Troyanski²)

¹University College Dublin, Ireland

²University of Murcia, Spain

New York Topology Conference, Summer 2011

Strictly convex norms

Definition (Clarkson, 1936)

A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is called *strictly convex* if $x = y$ whenever $\|x\| = \|y\| = \frac{1}{2} \|x + y\|$.

Natural norms are usually not strictly convex, but often a space can be given an *equivalent* strictly convex norm.

We concentrate on strictly convex *dual* norms on dual spaces.

Theorem (Šmuljan, 1940)

If $\|\cdot\|$ is a strictly convex *dual norm* on X^* then the predual $\|\cdot\|$ on X is Gâteaux smooth.

Strictly convex norms

Definition (Clarkson, 1936)

A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is called *strictly convex* if $x = y$ whenever $\|x\| = \|y\| = \frac{1}{2} \|x + y\|$.

Natural norms are usually not strictly convex, but often a space can be given an *equivalent* strictly convex norm.

We concentrate on strictly convex *dual* norms on dual spaces.

Theorem (Šmuljan, 1940)

If $\|\cdot\|$ is a strictly convex *dual norm* on X^* then the predual $\|\cdot\|$ on X is Gâteaux smooth.

Strictly convex norms

Definition (Clarkson, 1936)

A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is called *strictly convex* if $x = y$ whenever $\|x\| = \|y\| = \frac{1}{2} \|x + y\|$.

Natural norms are usually not strictly convex, but often a space can be given an *equivalent* strictly convex norm.

We concentrate on strictly convex *dual* norms on dual spaces.

Theorem (Šmuljan, 1940)

If $\|\cdot\|$ is a strictly convex *dual norm* on X^* then the predual $\|\cdot\|$ on X is Gâteaux smooth.

Strictly convex norms

Definition (Clarkson, 1936)

A norm $\|\cdot\|$ is called *strictly convex* if $x = y$ whenever $\|x\| = \|y\| = \frac{1}{2} \|x + y\|$.

Natural norms are usually not strictly convex, but often a space can be given an *equivalent* strictly convex norm.

We concentrate on strictly convex *dual* norms on dual spaces.

Theorem (Šmuljan, 1940)

If $\|\cdot\|$ is a strictly convex *dual norm* on X^* then the predual $\|\cdot\|$ on X is Gâteaux smooth.

Characterizing strict convexity

Question

Given a (dual) Banach space, does it admit a strictly convex (dual) norm?

Yes if e.g. X is separable, reflexive (more generally weakly compactly generated) or if $X = L_1(\mu)$.

No if e.g. $X = \ell_\infty^c(\Gamma)$, Γ uncountable.

Figures such as Day, Lindenstrauss, Mercourakis, Talagrand and Haydon have considered aspects of this question.

But no general characterization, in terms of linear topological structure, has emerged.

Characterizing strict convexity

Question

Given a (dual) Banach space, does it admit a strictly convex (dual) norm?

Yes if e.g. X is separable, reflexive (more generally weakly compactly generated) or if $X = L_1(\mu)$.

No if e.g. $X = \ell_\infty^c(\Gamma)$, Γ uncountable.

Figures such as Day, Lindenstrauss, Mercourakis, Talagrand and Haydon have considered aspects of this question.

But no general characterization, in terms of linear topological structure, has emerged.

Characterizing strict convexity

Question

Given a (dual) Banach space, does it admit a strictly convex (dual) norm?

Yes if e.g. X is separable, reflexive (more generally weakly compactly generated) or if $X = L_1(\mu)$.

No if e.g. $X = \ell_\infty^c(\Gamma)$, Γ uncountable.

Figures such as Day, Lindenstrauss, Mercourakis, Talagrand and Haydon have considered aspects of this question.

But no general characterization, in terms of linear topological structure, has emerged.

Characterizing strict convexity

Question

Given a (dual) Banach space, does it admit a strictly convex (dual) norm?

Yes if e.g. X is separable, reflexive (more generally weakly compactly generated) or if $X = L_1(\mu)$.

No if e.g. $X = \ell_\infty^c(\Gamma)$, Γ uncountable.

Figures such as Day, Lindenstrauss, Mercourakis, Talagrand and Haydon have considered aspects of this question.

But no general characterization, in terms of linear topological structure, has emerged.

Characterizing strict convexity

Question

Given a (dual) Banach space, does it admit a strictly convex (dual) norm?

Yes if e.g. X is separable, reflexive (more generally weakly compactly generated) or if $X = L_1(\mu)$.

No if e.g. $X = \ell_\infty^c(\Gamma)$, Γ uncountable.

Figures such as Day, Lindenstrauss, Mercourakis, Talagrand and Haydon have considered aspects of this question.

But no general characterization, in terms of linear topological structure, has emerged.

Definition and motivation for (*)

Definition

A topological space X has (*) if there are families \mathcal{U}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of open sets, such that for any $x, y \in X$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

- 1 $\{x, y\} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{U}_n$ is non-empty
- 2 $\{x, y\} \cap U$ is at most a singleton for all $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$.

Example

$X = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{U}_n = \{\text{open intervals of length } n^{-1}\}$.

Spaces having G_δ -diagonals have (*).

There are many compact non-metrizable spaces having (*).

Definition and motivation for (*)

Definition

A topological space X has (*) if there are families \mathcal{U}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of open sets, such that for any $x, y \in X$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

- 1 $\{x, y\} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{U}_n$ is non-empty
- 2 $\{x, y\} \cap U$ is at most a singleton for all $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$.

Example

$X = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{U}_n = \{\text{open intervals of length } n^{-1}\}$.

Spaces having G_δ -diagonals have (*).

There are many compact non-metrizable spaces having (*).

Definition and motivation for (*)

Definition

A topological space X has (*) if there are families \mathcal{U}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of open sets, such that for any $x, y \in X$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

- 1 $\{x, y\} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{U}_n$ is non-empty
- 2 $\{x, y\} \cap U$ is at most a singleton for all $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$.

Example

$X = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{U}_n = \{\text{open intervals of length } n^{-1}\}$.

Spaces having G_δ -diagonals have (*).

There are many compact non-metrizable spaces having (*).

Definition and motivation for (*)

Definition

A topological space X has (*) if there are families \mathcal{U}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of open sets, such that for any $x, y \in X$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

- 1 $\{x, y\} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{U}_n$ is non-empty
- 2 $\{x, y\} \cap U$ is at most a singleton for all $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$.

Example

$X = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{U}_n = \{\text{open intervals of length } n^{-1}\}$.

Spaces having G_δ -diagonals have (*).

There are many compact non-metrizable spaces having (*).

Definition and motivation for (*)

Definition

A topological space X has (*) if there are families \mathcal{U}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of open sets, such that for any $x, y \in X$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

- 1 $\{x, y\} \cap \bigcup \mathcal{U}_n$ is non-empty
- 2 $\{x, y\} \cap U$ is at most a singleton for all $U \in \mathcal{U}_n$.

Example

$X = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{U}_n = \{\text{open intervals of length } n^{-1}\}$.

Spaces having G_δ -diagonals have (*).

There are many compact non-metrizable spaces having (*).

Definition and motivation for (*)

Proposition

If a dual Banach space X^* admits a strictly convex *dual* norm, then (B_{X^*}, w^*) has (*).

Theorem

The space X^* admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if (B_{X^*}, w^*) has (*) *with slices*.

Question

To what extent can we do without the geometry, i.e. without slices?

Definition and motivation for (*)

Proposition

If a dual Banach space X^* admits a strictly convex *dual* norm, then (B_{X^*}, w^*) has (*).

Theorem

The space X^* admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if (B_{X^*}, w^*) has (*) *with slices*.

Question

To what extent can we do without the geometry, i.e. without slices?

Definition and motivation for (*)

Proposition

If a dual Banach space X^* admits a strictly convex *dual* norm, then (B_{X^*}, w^*) has (*).

Theorem

The space X^* admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if (B_{X^*}, w^*) has (*) *with slices*.

Question

To what extent can we do without the geometry, i.e. without slices?

Consequences of (*)

We study $C(K)$ spaces because they form a universal class:
 $X \hookrightarrow C(B_{X^*}, w^*)$.

Theorem

If K is compact and scattered then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if K has (*).

Theorem

- If X has (*) then X is fragmentable.
- Countably compact spaces having (*) are compact (generalizes Chaber). In particular, ω_1 does not have (*).
- If L is locally compact and has (*) then $L \cup \{\infty\}$ is countably tight.

Consequences of (*)

We study $C(K)$ spaces because they form a universal class:
 $X \hookrightarrow C(B_{X^*}, w^*)$.

Theorem

If K is compact and scattered then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if K has (*).

Theorem

- If X has (*) then X is fragmentable.
- Countably compact spaces having (*) are compact (generalizes Chaber). In particular, ω_1 does not have (*).
- If L is locally compact and has (*) then $L \cup \{\infty\}$ is countably tight.

Consequences of (*)

We study $C(K)$ spaces because they form a universal class:
 $X \hookrightarrow C(B_{X^*}, w^*)$.

Theorem

If K is compact and scattered then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if K has (*).

Theorem

- If X has (*) then X is fragmentable.
- Countably compact spaces having (*) are compact (generalizes Chaber). In particular, ω_1 does not have (*).
- If L is locally compact and has (*) then $L \cup \{\infty\}$ is countably tight.

Consequences of (*)

We study $C(K)$ spaces because they form a universal class:
 $X \hookrightarrow C(B_{X^*}, w^*)$.

Theorem

If K is compact and scattered then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if K has (*).

Theorem

- If X has (*) then X is fragmentable.
- Countably compact spaces having (*) are compact (generalizes Chaber). In particular, ω_1 does not have (*).
- If L is locally compact and has (*) then $L \cup \{\infty\}$ is countably tight.

Consequences of (*)

We study $C(K)$ spaces because they form a universal class:
 $X \hookrightarrow C(B_{X^*}, w^*)$.

Theorem

If K is compact and scattered then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm if and only if K has (*).

Theorem

- If X has (*) then X is fragmentable.
- Countably compact spaces having (*) are compact (generalizes Chaber). In particular, ω_1 does not have (*).
- If L is locally compact and has (*) then $L \cup \{\infty\}$ is countably tight.

Examples of spaces having (*)

Definition (Gruenhage, 1987)

A topological space X , $\text{card}(X) \leq \mathfrak{c}$, is *Gruenhage* if there are open sets U_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that if $x, y \in X$ then $\{x, y\} \cap U_n$ is a singleton for some n .

Metrizable, σ -discrete and descriptive compact spaces are Gruenhage. The tree $\sigma\mathbb{Q}$ is Gruenhage but not descriptive.

All Gruenhage spaces have (*).

Theorem (Smith, 2009)

If K is Gruenhage compact then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.

Examples of spaces having (*)

Definition (Gruenhage, 1987)

A topological space X , $\text{card}(X) \leq \mathfrak{c}$, is *Gruenhage* if there are open sets U_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that if $x, y \in X$ then $\{x, y\} \cap U_n$ is a singleton for some n .

Metrizable, σ -discrete and descriptive compact spaces are Gruenhage. The tree $\sigma\mathbb{Q}$ is Gruenhage but not descriptive.

All Gruenhage spaces have (*).

Theorem (Smith, 2009)

If K is Gruenhage compact then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.

Examples of spaces having (*)

Definition (Gruenhage, 1987)

A topological space X , $\text{card}(X) \leq \mathfrak{c}$, is *Gruenhage* if there are open sets U_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that if $x, y \in X$ then $\{x, y\} \cap U_n$ is a singleton for some n .

Metrizable, σ -discrete and descriptive compact spaces are Gruenhage. The tree $\sigma\mathbb{Q}$ is Gruenhage but not descriptive.

All Gruenhage spaces have (*).

Theorem (Smith, 2009)

If K is Gruenhage compact then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.

Examples of spaces having (*)

Definition (Gruenhage, 1987)

A topological space X , $\text{card}(X) \leq \mathfrak{c}$, is *Gruenhage* if there are open sets U_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that if $x, y \in X$ then $\{x, y\} \cap U_n$ is a singleton for some n .

Metrizable, σ -discrete and descriptive compact spaces are Gruenhage. The tree $\sigma\mathbb{Q}$ is Gruenhage but not descriptive.

All Gruenhage spaces have (*).

Theorem (Smith, 2009)

If K is Gruenhage compact then $C(K)^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.

Examples of spaces having (*)

Examples

- Kunen's compact S-space \mathcal{K} is Gruenhagen. In particular, $C(\mathcal{K})^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.
- Ostaszewski's space O is scattered but does not have (*), thus $C(O)^*$ does not admit a strictly convex dual norm.
- Using CH or $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$, there exist compact non-Gruenhagen spaces having (*), and with cardinality \aleph_1 .

Proposition

(MA) If L , $\text{card}(L) < \mathfrak{c}$, is locally compact, locally countable and has (*) then L is σ -discrete (and thus Gruenhagen).

Examples of spaces having (*)

Examples

- Kunen's compact S-space \mathcal{K} is Gruenhagen. In particular, $C(\mathcal{K})^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.
- Ostaszewski's space O is scattered but does not have (*), thus $C(O)^*$ does not admit a strictly convex dual norm.
- Using CH or $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$, there exist compact non-Gruenhagen spaces having (*), and with cardinality \aleph_1 .

Proposition

(MA) If L , $\text{card}(L) < \mathfrak{c}$, is locally compact, locally countable and has (*) then L is σ -discrete (and thus Gruenhagen).

Examples of spaces having (*)

Examples

- Kunen's compact S-space \mathcal{K} is Gruenhagen. In particular, $C(\mathcal{K})^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.
- Ostaszewski's space O is scattered but does not have (*), thus $C(O)^*$ does not admit a strictly convex dual norm.
- Using CH or $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$, there exist compact non-Gruenhagen spaces having (*), and with cardinality \aleph_1 .

Proposition

(MA) If L , $\text{card}(L) < \mathfrak{c}$, is locally compact, locally countable and has (*) then L is σ -discrete (and thus Gruenhagen).

Examples of spaces having (*)

Examples

- Kunen's compact S-space \mathcal{K} is Gruenhage. In particular, $C(\mathcal{K})^*$ admits a strictly convex dual norm.
- Ostaszewski's space O is scattered but does not have (*), thus $C(O)^*$ does not admit a strictly convex dual norm.
- Using CH or $\mathfrak{b} = \aleph_1$, there exist compact non-Gruenhage spaces having (*), and with cardinality \aleph_1 .

Proposition

(MA) If L , $\text{card}(L) < \mathfrak{c}$, is locally compact, locally countable and has (*) then L is σ -discrete (and thus Gruenhage).

Examples of spaces having (*)

ZFC Example

There exists a locally compact non-Gruenhagen space D having a G_δ -diagonal.

D is a 'duplicate' $\Lambda \times \{-1, 1\}$, where Λ is Kurepa's tree of injective functions

$$t : \alpha \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

with ordinal domain and co-infinite range.

A Baire category argument can be used to show that D is non-Gruenhagen.

Examples of spaces having (*)

ZFC Example

There exists a locally compact non-Gruenhagen space D having a G_δ -diagonal.

D is a 'duplicate' $\Lambda \times \{-1, 1\}$, where Λ is Kurepa's tree of injective functions

$$t : \alpha \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

with ordinal domain and co-infinite range.

A Baire category argument can be used to show that D is non-Gruenhagen.

Examples of spaces having (*)

ZFC Example

There exists a locally compact non-Gruenhagen space D having a G_δ -diagonal.

D is a 'duplicate' $\Lambda \times \{-1, 1\}$, where Λ is Kurepa's tree of injective functions

$$t : \alpha \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

with ordinal domain and co-infinite range.

A Baire category argument can be used to show that D is non-Gruenhagen.

Problems

Problems

- If K has $(*)$ then does $C(K)^*$ admit a strictly convex dual norm?
- In particular, what if $K = L \cup \{\infty\}$, where L has a G_δ -diagonal?
- If (B_{X^*}, w^*) has $(*)$, does X^* admit a strictly convex dual norm? What if X is also Asplund?
- Is $(*)$ preserved by continuous images of compact spaces, or more generally proper maps?

Problems

Problems

- If K has $(*)$ then does $C(K)^*$ admit a strictly convex dual norm?
- In particular, what if $K = L \cup \{\infty\}$, where L has a G_δ -diagonal?
- If (B_{X^*}, w^*) has $(*)$, does X^* admit a strictly convex dual norm? What if X is also Asplund?
- Is $(*)$ preserved by continuous images of compact spaces, or more generally proper maps?

Problems

Problems

- If K has $(*)$ then does $C(K)^*$ admit a strictly convex dual norm?
- In particular, what if $K = L \cup \{\infty\}$, where L has a G_δ -diagonal?
- If (B_{X^*}, w^*) has $(*)$, does X^* admit a strictly convex dual norm? What if X is also Asplund?
- Is $(*)$ preserved by continuous images of compact spaces, or more generally proper maps?

Problems

Problems

- If K has $(*)$ then does $C(K)^*$ admit a strictly convex dual norm?
- In particular, what if $K = L \cup \{\infty\}$, where L has a G_δ -diagonal?
- If (B_{X^*}, w^*) has $(*)$, does X^* admit a strictly convex dual norm? What if X is also Asplund?
- Is $(*)$ preserved by continuous images of compact spaces, or more generally proper maps?

References

- J. Orihuela, R. J. Smith and S. Troyanski, *Strictly convex norms and topology*, Proc. London Math. Soc (forthcoming).
- R. J. Smith, *Strictly convex norms, G_δ -diagonals and non-Gruenhage spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (forthcoming).