# Annals of Pure and Applied Mathematics

Vol. 24, No. 1, 2021, 77-81

ISSN: 2279-087X (P), 2279-0888(online)

Published on 19 September 2021 www.researchmathsci.org

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22457/apam.v24n1a09835



# **Strongly Proximinal Subspaces in Orlicz Function Space**

G. Ghawadrah\*

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, An-Najah National University Nablus, Palestine. E-mail: g.ghawadrah@najah.edu

Received 2 August 2021; accepted 5 September 2021

**Abstract.** In this paper, we prove that if Y is a separable proximinal subspace of X, then Y is strongly proximinal in X if and only if  $L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$  is strongly proximinal in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ . where  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$  is an Orlicz function space with Luxemburg norm.

**Keywords:** Strong proximinality, Orlicz function space

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 46E30

#### 1. Introduction

Let  $(X, \|.\|_X)$  be a normed linear space and G be a subset of X. For  $x \in X$ , let  $d(x, G) = \inf\{\|x - g\|_X : g \in G\}$  and let  $P_G(x) = \{g \in G : \|x - g\|_X = d(x, G)\}$ . If G is a subspace of X, an element  $g_0 \in G$  is called a best approximant of x in G if  $g_0 \in P_G(x)$ . Moreover, If for each  $x \in X$ ,  $P_G(x) \neq \emptyset$ , then G is said to be proximinal in X, for more see [5] and [6]. We recall the following definition of stronger version of approximation:

**Definition 1.1.** [4] A closed convex subset C of a Banach space X is said to be strongly proximinal if it is proximinal and for a given  $x \in X \setminus C$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $P_C(x,\delta) \subseteq P_C(x) + \varepsilon B_X$ , where  $P_C(x,\delta) = \{z \in C : ||x-z||_X \le d(x,C) + \delta\}$ .

From the definition of strong proximinality, it is clear that if Y is a strongly proximinal subspace of X, then the metric projection  $P_Y: X \to 2^Y$  is upper Hausdorff semi-continuous, abbreviated uHsc, for more see [3].

Let  $\phi$  be an Orlicz function on  $[0,\infty)$  (i.e. a continuous, strictly increasing, convex function satisfying  $\phi(0)=0$  and  $\lim_{t\to\infty}\phi(t)=\infty$ ). Let  $(\Omega,\Sigma,\mu)$  be a measure space. An Orlicz space  $L^{\phi}(\mu)$  is a space of all measurable functions  $f\colon\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int_{\Omega}\phi(c^{-1}|f(t)|)\,d\mu(t)<\infty$ , for some c>0, with norm

$$\|f\|_\phi=\inf\Bigl\{c>0:\int_\Omega\;\phi(c^{-1}|f(t)|)\;d\mu(t)\leq 1\,\Bigr\}.$$

Let  $M^{\phi}$  be a subspace of  $L^{\phi}(\mu)$  such that for all c>0,  $\int_{\Omega} \phi(c^{-1}|f(t)|) \ d\mu(t)<\infty$ .

For a real Banach space  $(X, \|.\|_X)$ , The Orlicz space  $L^{\overline{\phi}}(\mu, X)$  is a space of all strongly measurable functions  $f: \Omega \to X$  such that  $\int_{\Omega} \phi(c^{-1} \|f(t)\|_X) d\mu(t) < \infty$ , for some c > 0. Define a Luxemburg norm on  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$  by

### G. Ghawadrah

$$||f||_{\phi} = \inf \{c > 0: \int_{\Omega} \phi(c^{-1}||f(t)||_{X}) d\mu(t) \le 1 \},$$

the subspace  $M^{\phi}(X)$  contains all strongly measurable functions  $f: \Omega \to X$  such that for all c>0,  $\int_{\Omega}\phi(c^{-1}\|f(t)\|_X)\,d\mu(t)<\infty$ . The function  $\phi$  is said to satisfy  $\Delta_2$  – condition, denoted  $\phi\in\Delta_2$  if  $\phi(2t)\leq K\phi(t), t\geq t_0\geq 0$ , for some absolute constant K > 0, also we say  $\phi$  is  $\Delta_2$  - regular if  $\phi \in \Delta_2$ . It is known that if  $\phi$  is  $\Delta_2$  - regular, then  $M^{\phi}(X) = L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ ,  $M^{\phi} = L^{\phi}(\mu)$ , for more about Orlicz function spaces see [2]. There are many results about best approximation in Orlicz function space, reader is referred to [1,7,8,9,10]. In [3], Paul investigated the strong proximinality and ball proximinality in  $L^p(\mu, X)$ ,  $1 \le p \le \infty$ .

In this paper, we will prove that if Y is a separable proximinal subspace of X, then Y is strongly proximinal in X if and only if  $L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$  is strongly proximinal in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ .

#### 2. Main results

Throughout this paper we suppose  $\mu$  is a Lebesgue measure on  $\Omega = [0,1]$ ,  $\phi$  is  $\Delta_2$ -regular  $(\phi \in \Delta_2), \phi(1) = 1$  and X is a real Banach space.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let Y be a separable proximinal subspace of X such that  $P_Y$  is uHsc. Then for  $f \in L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$ ,  $g \in L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ :

$$d(f, P_{L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)}(g)) = ||d(f(.), P_{Y}(g(.)))||_{\phi}$$

**Proof:** From [1, Corollary 2.1] it implies that  $h \in P_{L^{\phi}(\mu,Y)}(g)$  if and only if  $h(t) \in$  $P_{Y}(g(t))$  a.e.

Thus, for every  $h \in P_{L^{\phi}(\mu,Y)}(g)$ ,  $||f(t) - h(t)|| \ge d(f(t), P_Y(g(t)))$  a.e. Since  $\phi$  is strictly increasing, then for every positive constant c we have

$$\phi(c^{-1}||f(t) - h(t)||) \ge \phi(c^{-1}d(f(t), P_Y(g(t))))$$

Hence, for every  $h \in P_{L^{\phi}(\mu,Y)}(g)$ ,  $||f - h||_{\phi} \ge ||d(f(.), P_Y(g(.)))||_{\phi}$ .

Therefore, 
$$d(f, P_{L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)}(g)) = \inf_{h \in P_{L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)}(g)} ||f - h||_{\phi} \ge ||d(f(.), P_{Y}(g(.)))||_{\phi}.$$

From [3, Lemma 3.3] there is a sequence of measurable selections  $\{h_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  where for all  $t, h_n(t) \in P_{P_Y(g(t))}(f(t), \frac{1}{n})$ , which leads to the inequality:

$$d(f(t), P_Y(g(t))) \le ||f(t) - h_n(t)||_X \le d(f(t), P_Y(g(t))) + \frac{1}{n}$$

Hence,  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|f(t)-h_n(t)\|_X = d(f(t),P_Y(g(t))).$ Let  $R_n(t) = \|f(t)-h_n(t)\|_X$  and  $K(t) = d(f(t),P_Y(g(t))), t \in [0,1],$  then  $K,R_n \in \mathbb{R}$  $L^{\phi}(\mu) (= M^{\phi}).$ 

Hence, for any fixed c>0,  $\lim_{n\to\infty}\phi\left(\frac{R_n(t)-K(t)}{c}\right)=0$  and  $\phi\left(\frac{R_n(t)-K(t)}{c}\right)\leq\phi(\frac{1}{c})$ ,  $t\in$ [0,1].

Therefore,  $\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^1\phi\left(\frac{R_n(t)-K(t)}{c}\right)d\mu(t)=0$  by dominated convergence theorem, so [Lemma 1, p. 157] in [2] implies  $\lim_{n\to\infty} ||R_n-K||_\phi = 0$  in  $L^\phi(\mu)$ . Hence,

# Strongly Proximinal Subspaces in Orlicz Function Space

 $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|R_n\|_{\phi} = \|K\|_{\phi}$  in  $L^{\phi}(\mu)$ . Thus,  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|f-h_n\|_{\phi} = \|d(f(.), P_Y(g(.)))\|_{\phi}$  in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ .

For all  $\in$  [0,1],  $h_n(t) \in P_Y(g(t))$ , so [1, Corollary 2.1] implies  $h_n \in P_{L^{\phi}(\mu,Y)}(g)$ . Therefore,  $d(f, P_{L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)}(g)) \le \lim_{n \to \infty} ||f - h_n||_{\phi} = ||d(f(.), P_Y(g(.)))||_{\phi}$ Thus,  $d(f, P_{L^{\phi}(u,Y)}(g)) = ||d(f(.), P_{Y}(g(.)))||_{\phi}$ .

**Theorem 2.2.** Let Y be a separable proximinal subspace of X. Y is strongly proximinal in X if and only if  $L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$  is strongly proximinal in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ .

**Proof:** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Let Y be strongly proximinal in X and  $L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$  be not strongly proximinal in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ .

Hence,  $\exists f \in L^{\phi}(\mu, X) \setminus L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$  and  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \exists g_n \in P_{L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)}(f, \frac{1}{n})$  and  $d(g_n, P_{L^{\phi}(u,Y)}(f)) \ge \varepsilon.$ 

Thus,  $0 < d(f, L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)) \le ||f - g_n||_{\phi} \le d(f, L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)) + \frac{1}{n}$ (1)

so it is clear that  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|f-g_n\|_{\phi} = d(f, L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)) = \|d(f(.), Y)\|_{\phi}$ . Since for all  $t \in [0,1]$ ,  $d(f(t), Y) \le \|f(t)\|_X$ , then inequality (1) implies that

 $\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\beta_n} \le \frac{\|f(t)\|_X}{\alpha} \quad \text{where } \alpha = d(f,L^{\phi}(\mu,Y)), \text{ and } \beta_n = \|f-g_n\|_{\phi}. \text{ Since } \phi \text{ is}$ 

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\beta_n}\right) d\mu(t) = \int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\alpha}\right) d\mu(t).$$

increasing and  $\Delta_2$ - regular, then  $\phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\beta_n}\right) \leq \phi\left(\frac{\|f(t)\|_X}{\alpha}\right)$ ,  $\int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{\|f(t)\|_X}{\alpha}\right) d\mu\left(t\right) < \infty$ , (i.e.  $\phi\left(\frac{\|f(t)\|_X}{\alpha}\right) \in L^1(\mu)$ ) and  $\lim_{n \to \infty} \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\beta_n}\right) = \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\alpha}\right)$  for all  $t \in [0,1]$ . Therefore, dominated convergence theorem in  $L^1(\mu)$  implies that  $\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\beta_n}\right) d\mu(t) = \int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\alpha}\right) d\mu(t).$  Lemma 2.2 and Remark 2.1in [1] (or by [Proposition 6, p. 77] in [2]) imply that  $\int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\alpha}\right) d\mu(t) = 1 \text{ and } \forall n, \int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{\|f(t)-g_n(t)\|_X}{\beta_n}\right) d\mu(t) = 1. \text{ Hence, we have the following}$ 

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{\|f(t)-g_n(t)\|_X}{\beta_n}\right) d\mu(t) = \int_0^1 \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\alpha}\right) d\mu(t),$$

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^1 \left( \phi\left( \frac{\|f(t) - g_n(t)\|_X}{\beta_n} \right) - \phi\left( \frac{d(f(t), Y)}{\beta_n} \right) \right) d\mu(t) = 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^1 \left| \phi\left(\frac{\|f(t)-g_n(t)\|_X}{\beta_n}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\beta_n}\right) \right| d\mu(t) = 0.$$

Then there exists a subsequence  $\left\{\phi\left(\frac{\left\|f(t)-g_{n_i}(t)\right\|_X}{\beta_{n_i}}\right)-\phi\left(\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\beta_{n_i}}\right)\right\}$  converges to 0 a.e.

and hence  $\lim_{i \to \infty} \phi\left(\frac{\left\|f(t) - g_{n_i}(t)\right\|_X}{\beta_{n_i}}\right) = \phi\left(\frac{d(f(t), Y)}{\alpha}\right)$ . Since  $\phi$  is continuous and strictly

increasing, then  $\phi^{-1}$  is a continuous function, so we get that  $\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{\|f(t)-g_{n_i}(t)\|_X}{\beta_{n_i}}=$  $\frac{d(f(t),Y)}{\alpha}$  a.e.

#### G. Ghawadrah

Hence,  $\lim_{i\to\infty} \|f(t)-g_{n_i}(t)\|_X = d(f(t),Y)$  a.e. because  $\lim_{i\to\infty} \beta_{n_i} = \alpha$ . Now, since Y is strongly proximinal, then we have that  $\lim_{i\to\infty} d\left(g_{n_i}(t), P_Y(f(t))\right) = 0$ .

Since 
$$\forall c>0$$
,  $\phi\left(\frac{d\left(g_{n_i}(t),P_Y(f(t))\right)}{c}\right)\leq \phi\left(\frac{2\|f(t)\|_X}{c}\right)$  a.e. and  $\int_0^1\phi\left(\frac{2\|f(t)\|_X}{\alpha}\right)d\mu\left(t\right)<\infty$ , (i.e.  $\phi\left(\frac{2\|f(t)\|_X}{\alpha}\right)\in L^1(\mu)$ ), then dominated convergence theorem in  $L^1(\mu)$  implies that  $\lim_{i\to\infty}\int_0^1\phi\left(\frac{d\left(g_{n_i}(t),P_Y(f(t))\right)}{c}\right)d\mu\left(t\right)=0$ . Therefore, by [Lemma 1, p.157] in [2] we have that  $\lim_{i\to\infty}d\left(g_{n_i},P_{L^\phi(\mu,Y)}(f)\right)=\lim_{i\to\infty}\left\|d\left(g_{n_i}(t),P_Y(f(t))\right)\right\|_\phi=0$ , which contradicts our assumption on  $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

 $(\Leftarrow)$ Let  $L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$  be strongly proximinal in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$  and Y be not strongly proximinal in X.

Hence,  $\exists x \in X \ Y$  and  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\forall \delta > 0$ ,  $\exists y_\delta \in P_Y(x,\delta)$  and  $d(y_\delta,P_Y(x)) > \varepsilon$ . Consider f(t) = x and  $g_\delta(t) = y_\delta$  for all  $t \in [0,1]$ , so  $f \in L^\phi(\mu,X)$  and  $\forall \delta, g_\delta \in L^\phi(\mu,Y)$ . Since  $d(f,L^\phi(\mu,Y)) = d(x,Y)$  and  $d(g_\delta,P_{L^\phi(\mu,Y)}(f)) = d(y_\delta,P_Y(x))$  by Theorem 2.1, then  $g_\delta \in P_{L^\phi(\mu,Y)}(f,\delta)$  and  $d(g_\delta,P_{L^\phi(\mu,Y)}(f)) > \varepsilon$  and hence  $L^\phi(\mu,Y)$  is not strongly proximinal, which is a contradiction.

### 3. Conclusion

We conclude that if Y is a separable proximinal subspace of X, then Y is strongly proximinal in X if and only if  $L^{\phi}(\mu, Y)$  is strongly proximinal in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ .

**Acknowledgement.** The author would like to thank the referee for his/her suggestions.

**Conflict of interest.** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Authors' Contributions. All the authors contribute equally to this work.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. H.Al-Minawi and S.Ayesh, Best approximation in Orlicz spaces, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, 14(2) (1991) 245-252.
- 2. M.M.Rao, Z.D.Ren, *Theory of Orlicz Spaces*, New York, M. Dekker, (1991).
- 3. T.Paul, Various notions of best approximation property in spaces of Bochner integrable functions, *Advances in Operator Theory*, 2(1) (2017) 59-77
- 4. G.Godefroy and V.Indumathi, Strong proximinality and polyhedral spaces, *Rev. Mat. Complut.*, 14(1) (2001) 105-125.
- 5. I.Singer, Best Approximation In Normed Linear Spaces By Elements of Linear Subspaces, springer -verlay, NewYork.
- 6. W.Light, W.Cheney, *Approximation Theory in Tensor Product Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1169, Springer–Verlag Berlin, 9–155. 1985.
- 7. A.A.Hakawati and S.A.Dwaik, On best approximation in  $L^1(\mu, X)$  and  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ , Annals of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 12(1) (2016) 1-8.

# Strongly Proximinal Subspaces in Orlicz Function Space

- 8. A.A.Hakawati and S.A.Dwaik, On best approximation in  $L^p(\mu, X)$  and  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$ ,  $1 \le p < \infty$ , *Journal of Mathematics and Informatics*, 6 (2016) 31-39.
- 9. A.A.Hakawati and G.Ghawadrah, Proximinally additive Chebychev spaces in  $L^{\phi}(\mu, X)$  and  $L^{p}(\mu, X)$ ,  $1 \le p < \infty$ , Progress in Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos, 4(2) (2016) 103-110.
- 10. J.Xu, Proximinality in Banach space valued Musielak-Orlicz spaces, *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 2014(1) (2014) 146.