

### Exercise 7.1.

Let  $V$  be a Banach space,  $W \subset V$  a closed linear subspace and  $v \in V \setminus W$ . Show that there exists a linear functional  $\ell \in V^*$  such that  $\langle \ell, v \rangle \neq 0$  but  $\langle \ell, w \rangle = 0$  for all  $w \in W$ . Moreover, show that one can choose  $\ell$  such that  $\langle \ell, v \rangle = \text{dist}(v, W)$  and  $\|\ell\| \leq 1$ .

**Solution:** Let  $d := \text{dist}(v, W)$  and define the linear map  $\ell_0 : W + \mathbb{R}v \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $w + \lambda v \mapsto \lambda d$ . This is well defined since  $v \notin W$ , and moreover, for  $\lambda \neq 0$ ,

$$\|w + \lambda v\| = |\lambda| \left\| \frac{w}{\lambda} + v \right\| \geq |\lambda| \text{dist}(v, W) = |\lambda d| = |\langle \ell_0, w + \lambda v \rangle|,$$

so that  $\|\ell_0\| \leq 1$ . Applying Hahn–Banach we get an extension  $\ell : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\|\ell\| \leq 1$  still vanishing on  $W$ . Since  $W$  is closed,  $\text{dist}(v, W) > 0$  and hence  $\langle \ell, v \rangle = d > 0$ .

### Exercise 7.2.

Prove that any closed linear subspace of a reflexive Banach space is also reflexive.

**Solution:** Let  $W$  be a closed linear subspace of a Banach space  $V$ , and let  $i : W \rightarrow V$  denote the natural inclusion. Then we get a dual map  $i^* : V^* \rightarrow W^*$ , namely the restriction to  $W$ . Given  $\phi \in W^{**}$ , consider  $i^{**}\phi \in V^{**}$ , namely the composition  $\phi \circ i^*$ . Since  $V$  is reflexive we have that there exists  $v \in V$  such that for all  $\ell \in V^*$ ,  $\langle i^{**}\phi, \ell \rangle = \langle \ell, v \rangle$ .

We claim that  $v \in W$ : otherwise, Exercise 7.1 gives us a linear map  $\ell \in V^*$  such that  $\langle \ell, v \rangle \neq 0$  but  $\langle \ell, w \rangle = 0$  for all  $w \in W$ . This last condition means that  $i^*\ell = 0$ , whence

$$\langle \ell, v \rangle = \langle i^{**}\phi, \ell \rangle = \langle \phi, i^*\ell \rangle = 0,$$

a contradiction. In order to show that this  $v \in W$  is the desired vector, we first need to show that  $i^* : V^* \rightarrow W^*$  is surjective: given a linear bounded functional  $\vartheta : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the Hahn–Banach theorem allows us to extend it to some  $\ell : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and in particular  $i^*\ell = \vartheta$ . Finally, for such  $\vartheta \in W^*$ , we have that  $\langle \phi, \vartheta \rangle = \langle \phi, i^*\ell \rangle = \langle i^{**}\phi, \ell \rangle = \langle \ell, v \rangle = \langle \vartheta, v \rangle$  and we are done.

### Exercise 7.3.

Let  $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$  be a Banach space. Prove that  $E$  is reflexive if and only if  $E^*$  is reflexive.

**Solution:** Suppose first that  $E$  is reflexive, so that the natural embedding  $J_E : E \rightarrow E^{**}$  is surjective and hence an isomorphism. This gives us an isomorphism  $J_E^* : E^{***} \rightarrow E^*$ . We claim that the inverse of this isomorphism is  $J_{E^*} : E^* \rightarrow E^{***}$ : given  $x \in E$  and  $\ell \in E^*$ , we have that

$$\langle J_E^* J_{E^*} \ell, x \rangle_{E^*, E} = \langle J_{E^*} \ell, J_E x \rangle_{E^{***}, E^{**}} = \langle J_E x, \ell \rangle_{E^{**}, E^*} = \langle \ell, x \rangle_{E^*, E}.$$

Hence  $J_E^* J_{E^*} \ell = \ell$ , so  $J_{E^*}$  is also an isomorphism.

Conversely, if  $E^*$  is reflexive, then by what we have shown  $E^{***}$  is also reflexive, and given that  $E \subset E^{***}$  is a closed subspace (as  $E$  is Banach), by Exercise 7.2 we have that  $E$  is reflexive too.

### Exercise 7.4.

Let  $E$  be a Banach space,  $J : E \rightarrow E^{**}$  the natural embedding into its bidual, and denote by  $B_E$  and  $B_{E^{**}}$  the respective closed unit balls. The goal of this exercise is to prove the following lemma of Goldstine: that  $J(B_E)$  is dense in  $B_{E^{**}}$  with respect to the weak-\* topology (of  $E^{**}$  with respect to  $E^*$ ).

(a) Show that it is enough to prove that, given  $\xi \in B_{E^{**}}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , an integer  $N$ , and linearly independent forms  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_N \in E^*$ ,

$$\exists z \in B_E \quad \text{s.t.} \quad |\langle \ell_i, z \rangle - \langle \xi, \ell_i \rangle| \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (\star)$$

**Solution:** The only thing to prove is that one can reduce to the case where  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_N$  are linearly independent: we may suppose that the first  $n \leq N$  of them are linearly independent and the rest are linear combinations of them. Thus  $(\star)$  for  $i \leq n$  implies  $(\star)$  for  $i > n$  up to replacing  $\varepsilon$  by  $C\varepsilon$  for some constant  $C$ . The result follows by making  $\varepsilon$  smaller if necessary.

(b) Let  $T : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  be defined by  $u \mapsto (\langle \ell_i, u \rangle)_{i=1}^N$ . Show that  $T$  is surjective and that any map  $\phi \in E^*$  vanishing on  $\ker T$  is a linear combination of  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_N$ .

**Solution:** If  $T$  were not surjective, its image would lie on a hyperplane of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and therefore there would exist  $0 \neq (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  such that

$$\langle a_1 \ell_1 + \dots + a_N \ell_N, u \rangle = a_1 \langle \ell_1, u \rangle + \dots + a_N \langle \ell_N, u \rangle = 0 \quad \forall u \in E,$$

contradicting the linear independence of the  $\ell_i$ . In particular we get  $u_i \in E$  such that  $T(u_i) = e_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  (here  $\{e_i\}$  is the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ).

Let now  $\phi \in E^*$  vanish on  $\ker T$ . Given  $u \in E$ , since  $u - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \ell_i, u \rangle u_i$  lies in  $\ker T$ , we have that

$$\left\langle \phi - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \phi, u_i \rangle \ell_i, u \right\rangle = \langle \phi, u \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \ell_i, u \rangle \langle \phi, u_i \rangle = \left\langle \phi, u - \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \ell_i, u \rangle u_i \right\rangle = 0,$$

so  $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \phi, u_i \rangle \ell_i$ .

(c) Show that given  $\delta > 0$ , one can find  $y \in E$  with  $\|y\| \leq 1 + \delta$  such that  $\langle \ell_i, y \rangle = \langle \xi, \ell_i \rangle$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

**Hint:** start with any solution of the system and improve it with the help of Exercise 7.1.

**Solution:** If  $\langle \xi, \ell_i \rangle = 0$  for all  $i$ , then we may trivially choose  $y = 0$  and we are done. Otherwise part (b) gives us some  $x \in E$  which satisfies  $Tx = (\langle \xi, \ell_i \rangle)_i$ . Denoting  $K := \ker T \subset E$  and  $d := \text{dist}(x, K)$ , we have that  $Tx \neq 0 \Rightarrow x \notin K \Rightarrow d > 0$ . Exercise 7.1 now gives us a map  $\phi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with norm  $\|\phi\| \leq 1$  vanishing on  $K$  and such that  $\langle \phi, x \rangle = d$ .

By part (b),  $\phi$  is a linear combination of the  $\ell_i$  and hence  $\langle \phi, x \rangle = \langle \xi, \phi \rangle$ . Then  $d = \langle \phi, x \rangle = \langle \xi, \phi \rangle \leq \|\xi\| \|\phi\| \leq 1$  and hence  $\exists w \in K$  such that  $\|x - w\| \leq 1 + \delta$ . The choice  $y = x - w$  satisfies all the required properties.

(d) Conclude the proof of Goldstine's lemma.

**Solution:** Let  $z = (1 + \delta)^{-1}y \in B_E$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \ell_i, z \rangle - \langle \xi, \ell_i \rangle| &= |(1 + \delta)^{-1} \langle \ell_i, y \rangle - \langle \ell_i, y \rangle| = (1 - (1 + \delta)^{-1}) |\langle \ell_i, y \rangle| \\ &\leq C(1 - (1 + \delta)^{-1})(1 + \delta) = C\delta \leq \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

if  $\delta$  is chosen small enough.

### Exercise 7.5.

We say that a Banach space  $(E, \|\cdot\|)$  is *uniformly convex* if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $x, y \in E$ ,

$$\|x\| \leq 1, \quad \|y\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|x - y\| \geq \varepsilon \quad \implies \quad \left\| \frac{x + y}{2} \right\| \leq 1 - \delta.$$

In this exercise we will prove the Milman–Pettis theorem: every uniformly convex Banach space is reflexive. To do that, fix  $\xi \in E^{**}$  with  $\|\xi\| = 1$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $\delta > 0$  be the corresponding number from the uniform convexity condition, and choose  $\ell \in E^*$  such that  $\|\ell\| = 1$  and  $\langle \xi, \ell \rangle > 1 - \delta/2$ . Moreover let  $V := \{\zeta \in E^{**} : \langle \zeta, \ell \rangle > 1 - \delta\}$ .

(a) Show that the diameter of  $V \cap J(B_E)$  is at most  $\varepsilon$ .

**Solution:** Let  $x, y \in B_E$  such that  $J(x), J(y) \in V$ . Suppose that  $\|J(x) - J(y)\| = \|x - y\| \geq \varepsilon$ . Then the choice of  $\delta$  implies that  $\|x + y\| \leq 2 - 2\delta$  which contradicts the following inequality:

$$(1 - \delta) + (1 - \delta) < \langle J(x), \ell \rangle + \langle J(y), \ell \rangle = \langle J(x + y), \ell \rangle \leq \|J(x + y)\| = \|x + y\|.$$

(b) Show that  $B_\varepsilon(\xi) \cap J(B_E) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Hint:** take any  $J(x) \in J(B_E) \cap V$  and show that  $\|J(x) - \xi\| \leq \varepsilon$  using Exercise 7.4.

**Solution:** Since  $\|\xi\| = 1$  and  $V \ni \xi$  is a weak-\* neighborhood, by Exercise 7.4 we may find  $x \in B_E$  such that  $J(x) \in V$ . We know that the function  $f : E^{**} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\|J(x) - \cdot\|$  is weak-\* lower semicontinuous (as its lower level sets are strongly closed and convex). Since, by part (a),  $f^{-1}([0, \varepsilon])$  contains  $J(B_E) \cap V$ , and we have just shown that it is weak-\* closed, it must contain the weak-\* closure of  $J(B_E) \cap V$ . Now it is enough to show that  $\xi$  is in this closure: this follows from the fact that, given a weak-\* open set  $W \ni \xi$ , again by exercise 7.4,  $J(B_E) \cap V \cap W \neq \emptyset$ .

(c) Conclude the proof of the Milman–Pettis theorem.

**Solution:** Since we can take  $\varepsilon > 0$  arbitrary in part (b), and since  $J(E)$  is a closed subspace of  $E^{**}$  (as it is Banach), we obtain that  $\xi \in J(E)$ . As  $\xi$  was arbitrary, this shows that  $E$  is reflexive.

### Exercise 7.6.

Let  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

(a) Show that  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  is not separable.

**Solution:** Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $R > 0$  such that  $B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega$ , and consider the functions  $\mathbb{1}_{B_r(x_0)} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  for  $0 < r < R$ . Then for  $0 < r, s < R$  distinct we have that

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{B_r(x_0)} - \mathbb{1}_{B_s(x_0)}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1,$$

therefore these functions form an uncountable discrete subset and this is impossible in a separable metric space.

(b) Prove that  $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$  is dense in  $L^p(\Omega)$  for every  $1 \leq p < +\infty$ , and hence that  $L^p(\Omega)$  is separable for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .

**Solution:** For the proof of the density of  $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ , see Section 3.3 in the script. For the separability, we know that for each  $R \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $C_c^0(\Omega \cap B_R)$  is separable with respect to the uniform convergence, so there exist countable dense collections  $\{\varphi_{j,R}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

Given  $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ , with  $1 \leq p < +\infty$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , choose  $R \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega \setminus B_R)} < \varepsilon/3$  and then  $g \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \cap B_R)$  with  $\|f - g\|_{L^p(\Omega \cap B_R)} \leq \varepsilon/3$ . Finally choose  $j$  such that

$$\varphi_{j,R} \in C_c^0(\Omega \cap B_R) \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \|\varphi_{j,R} - g\|_{C^0(\Omega \cap B_R)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3|B_R|^{1/p}}.$$

We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \varphi_{j,R}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} &= \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega \setminus B_R)} + \|f - \varphi_{j,R}\|_{L^p(\Omega \cap B_R)} \\ &= \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega \setminus B_R)} + \|f - g\|_{L^p(\Omega \cap B_R)} + \|g - \varphi_{j,R}\|_{L^p(\Omega \cap B_R)} \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + |B_R|^{1/p} \|g - \varphi_{j,R}\|_{C^0(\Omega \cap B_R)} \leq \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

### Exercise 7.7.

Proof the so-called Littlewood inequality in a measure space  $(X, \mu)$ : given  $1 \leq p_0 < p_1 \leq +\infty$  and  $t \in (0, 1)$ , define  $p_t \in [1, +\infty]$  by

$$\frac{1}{p_t} = \frac{1-t}{p_0} + \frac{t}{p_1};$$

then for any  $f \in L^{p_0}(X, \mu) \cap L^{p_1}(X, \mu)$  it holds that

$$f \in L^{p_t}(X, \mu) \quad \text{with} \quad \|f\|_{L^{p_t}} \leq \|f\|_{L^{p_0}}^{1-t} \|f\|_{L^{p_1}}^t.$$

**Solution:** Let  $f \in L^{p_0}(X, \mu) \cap L^{p_1}(X, \mu)$  and write  $|f| = |f|^{1-t} |f|^t$ . Then Hölder's inequality with exponents  $p_0/(1-t)$  and  $p_1/t$ , which satisfy

$$\frac{1}{p_t} = \frac{1}{p_0/(1-t)} + \frac{1}{p_1/t},$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{L^{pt}} &\leq \| |f|^{1-t} \|_{L^{p_0/(1-t)}} \| |f|^t \|_{L^{p_1/t}} \\ &= \left( \int_X (|f|^{1-t})^{p_0/(1-t)} d\mu \right)^{(1-t)/p_0} \left( \int_X (|f|^t)^{p_1/t} d\mu \right)^{t/p_1} \\ &= \|f\|_{L^{p_0}}^{1-t} \|f\|_{L^{p_1}}^t.\end{aligned}$$