

NONDENTABLE SETS IN BANACH SPACES

S. J. DILWORTH, CHRIS GARTLAND, DENKA KUTZAROVA,
AND N. LOVASOA RANDRIANARIVONY

ABSTRACT. In his study of the Radon-Nikodým property of Banach spaces, Bourgain showed (among other things) that in any closed, bounded, convex set A that is nondentable, one can find a separated, weakly closed bush. In this note, we prove a generalization of Bourgain's result: in any bounded, nondentable set A (not necessarily closed or convex) one can find a separated, weakly closed approximate bush. Similarly, we obtain as corollaries the existence of A -valued quasimartingales with sharply divergent behavior.

1. INTRODUCTION

We were motivated by the question of whether using the Kuratowski measure of noncompactness in place of diameter leads to a different notion of dentability of (not necessarily closed or convex) subsets of X . Proposition 3.1 shows that they do not. This generalizes results from [Bou79, Chapitre 4] where A is assumed to be closed, bounded, and convex. In Section 3, we obtain as corollaries A -valued quasimartingales and $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ -valued martingales with sharply divergent behavior (Corollaries 3.3 and 3.4) whenever A is non- ε -dentable. In Section 4, we improve the results of Section 3 by showing that the range of the quasimartingale can be made weakly closed. As a further corollary, we show that one can find a countable set F with $\lim_{F \ni f \rightarrow \infty} d(f, A) \rightarrow 0$ such that $\overline{\text{co}}(F) \cap \text{Ext}(\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F)) = \emptyset$ (Corollary 4.9).

2. PRELIMINARIES

For any topological vector space V over \mathbb{R} and $E \subseteq V$, let $\text{co}(E)$ denote the convex hull of E , and $\overline{\text{co}}(E)$ the closure of $\text{co}(E)$ in V . Henceforth, let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space over \mathbb{R} . For $r > 0$ and $x \in X$, $B_r(x)$ denotes the open ball of radius r centered at x . B_X denotes the closed unit ball of X .

Definition 2.1. For any $A \subseteq X$, let $\alpha(A)$ be the infimum over all $\varepsilon > 0$ so that A can be covered by finitely many sets of diameter at most ε . $\alpha(A)$ is called the *Kuratowski measure of noncompactness* of A .

Definition 2.2. For any bounded, nonempty $A \subseteq X$, $f \in B_{X^*}$ (unit ball of X^*), and $\delta > 0$, we define the *slice* $S(f, A, \delta)$, to be the set $\{a \in A : f(a) > \sup f(A) - \delta\}$. A *slice of A* is a set $S(f, A, \delta)$ for some $f \in B_{X^*}$ and $\delta > 0$.

Remark 2.3. Geometrically, a slice of A is a nonempty intersection of A with an open half-plane. Note that if $S(f, \overline{\text{co}}(A), \delta)$ is a slice of $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$, then $S(f, \overline{\text{co}}(A), \delta) \cap A =$

The third author was supported by Simons Foundation Collaborative Grant No 636954.
The fourth author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1301591.

$S(f, A, \delta)$ is a slice of A . This is due to the fact that

$$\sup(f(\overline{\text{co}}(A))) = \sup(\overline{f(\text{co}(A))}) = \sup(f(\text{co}(A))) = \sup(\text{co}(f(A))) = \sup(f(A))$$

Definition 2.4. A bounded set $A \subseteq X$ is called ε -dentable if there exists a slice of A with $\text{diam}(A) \leq \varepsilon$, and *non- ε -dentable* otherwise. A is *dentable* if it is ε -dentable for every $\varepsilon > 0$, and *nondentable* otherwise.

Remark 2.5. By Remark 2.3, if $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ is ε -dentable, A is ε -dentable.

Definition 2.6. If V is a topological vector space, $E \subseteq V$ and $e \in E$, e is called a *denting point* of E if $e \notin \overline{\text{co}}(E \setminus U)$ for every neighborhood U of e . Special cases are when V is a Banach space equipped with the weak topology, or a dual Banach space equipped with the weak* topology, in which case we call e a *weak denting point* or a *weak* denting point*, respectively.

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$ denote the set of finite length sequences of natural numbers. A *tree* is a nonempty set \mathbb{T} such that if $b \in \mathbb{T}$ and $b = (b', i)$ for some $b' \in \mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $b' \in \mathbb{T}$. In this case, b is called a *child* of b' . We say that \mathbb{T} is *finitely branching* if each $b \in \mathbb{T}$ has only finitely many children. If $b \in \mathbb{T}$ has k children, we assume that they are $(b, 1), \dots, (b, k)$. Given a sequence $b \in \mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$, we let $|b|$ denote its length. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\mathbb{T}_{\leq n} = \{b \in \mathbb{T} : |b| \leq n\}$, $\mathbb{T}_n = \{b \in \mathbb{T} : |b| = n\}$, and $\mathbb{T}_{\geq n} = \{b \in \mathbb{T} : |b| \geq n\}$. Given a positive sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, finitely branching tree \mathbb{T} , and subset $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}} \subseteq X$ indexed by \mathbb{T} , we say that $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ is a $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -*approximate bush* if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \mathbb{T}_n$ with children $(b, 1), \dots, (b, k)$, $b \in \text{co}(x_{(b,1)}, \dots, x_{(b,k)}) + B_{\delta_n}(0)$. If it always holds that $b \in \text{co}(x_{(b,1)}, \dots, x_{(b,k)})$, then $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ is a *bush*. An approximate bush $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ is δ -*separated* if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \mathbb{T}_n$ and child (b, i) , $\|x_b - x_{(b,i)}\| > \delta$.

Definition 2.8. Given a filtration $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and a positive sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, we say that a sequence of X -valued, $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted random variables $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -*quasimartingale* if

$$\|\mathbb{E}(M_{n+1} | \mathcal{A}_n) - M_n\|_{\infty} \leq \delta_n$$

for all $n \geq 0$. If $\|\mathbb{E}(M_{n+1} | \mathcal{A}_n) - M_n\|_{\infty} = 0$ always holds, $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a *martingale*.

The following proposition can be found in [Bou79, Lemme 4.2]. For the sake of self-containment, we include our own proof here.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. Suppose that C and C_1 are closed, bounded, convex sets with C_1 properly contained in C . If $C = \overline{\text{co}}(C_1 \cup C_2)$, where C_2 is a convex subset of C and $\text{diam}(C_2) < \varepsilon$, then there exists a slice S of C with $S \subseteq C_2 + B_{\delta}(0)$. In particular, C is ε -dentable.*

Proof. We may assume that $\text{diam}(C) \leq 1$. Since C_1 is a proper convex subset of C , by Hahn-Banach separation there exists $f \in B_{X^*}$ such that

$$\sup f(C_1) < M := \sup f(C)$$

Hence $C_1 \subseteq C \setminus S(f, C, \alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. So

$$C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S(f, C, \alpha)) \cup C_2)$$

For $\gamma > 0$, let $S_\gamma = S(f, C, \gamma)$. Consider $y \in S_\gamma$. There exist $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $z_1 \in \text{co}(C \setminus S(f, C, \alpha))$, and $z_2 \in C_2$ such that $\|y - \lambda z_1 - (1 - \lambda)z_2\| < \gamma$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} M - \gamma &< f(y) \\ &\leq f(\lambda z_1 + (1 - \lambda)z_2) + \|y - \lambda z_1 - (1 - \lambda)z_2\| \\ &< \lambda f(z_1) + (1 - \lambda)f(z_2) + \gamma \\ &\leq \lambda(M - \alpha) + (1 - \lambda)M + \gamma \\ &= M - \lambda\alpha + \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\lambda < 2\gamma/\alpha$. So

$$\|y - z_2\| < \lambda\|z_1 - z_2\| + \gamma \leq (2\gamma/\alpha) \text{diam}(C) + \gamma \leq \gamma(2/\alpha + 1)$$

So, setting $\gamma := \frac{\delta\alpha}{2+\alpha}$, we get $S := S_\gamma \subseteq C_2 + B_\delta(0)$. Note that $\text{diam}(S) \leq \text{diam}(C_2) + 2\delta < \varepsilon$ for δ sufficiently small. So C is ε -dentable. \square

We now derive a corollary of this proposition that will play a crucial role in the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Corollary 2.10. *For any closed, bounded, convex, non- ε -dentable $C \subseteq X$, any closed, convex $C' \subseteq C$, and any $D \subseteq C$ with $\alpha(D) < \varepsilon$, if $C = \overline{\text{co}}(C' \cup D)$, then $C = C'$.*

Proof. Let C , C' , and D be as above. Assume $C = \overline{\text{co}}(C' \cup D)$. Since $\alpha(D) < \varepsilon$, $D = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \dots \cup B_n$ for some $B_i \subseteq D$ with $\text{diam}(B_i) < \varepsilon$. Let $C_i = \overline{\text{co}}(B_i)$. Then $\text{diam}(C_i) = \text{diam}(B_i) < \varepsilon$, and $C = \overline{\text{co}}(C' \cup C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_n)$. Since C is closed, bounded, convex, and not ε -dentable, and since $C_n \subseteq C$ is closed, convex with $\text{diam}(C_n) < \varepsilon$, Proposition 2.9 (with $C_2 = C_n$ and $C_1 = \overline{\text{co}}(C' \cup C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_{n-1})$) implies that $C = \overline{\text{co}}(C' \cup C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_{n-1})$. Since $\text{diam}(C_{n-1}) < \varepsilon$, we may apply Proposition 2.9 again to obtain $C = \overline{\text{co}}(C' \cup C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \dots \cup C_{n-2})$. Iterating, we get $C = C'$. \square

3. δ -SEPARATED MARTINGALES AND BUSHES

Proposition 3.1. *Let $A \subseteq X$ be bounded, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\alpha(S) \geq \varepsilon$ for every slice $S \subseteq A$.
- (2) $\text{diam}(S) \geq \varepsilon$ for every slice S of A (A is non- ε -dentable).
- (3) $\text{diam}(S) \geq \varepsilon$ for every slice S of $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ ($\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ is non- ε -dentable).

Proof. Let A , ε be as above. (1) \rightarrow (2) is clear from definition of α . (2) \rightarrow (3) follows from the fact that every slice of $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ contains a slice of A . We now show (3) \rightarrow (1) by contradiction. Let $C = \overline{\text{co}}(A)$, assume that C is non- ε -dentable and that there exists a slice $S = S(f, A, \delta)$ of A with $\alpha(S) < \varepsilon$. Set $S_C = S(f, C, \delta)$. Then since $C \setminus S_C$ is a closed convex subset of C and $C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S_C) \cup S)$. Then Corollary 2.10 implies $C = C \setminus S_C$, a contradiction since $S_C \subseteq C$ and S_C is nonempty. \square

As in [Bou79, Chapitre 4], we obtain several corollaries.

Corollary 3.2. *For any $A \subseteq X$ bounded and $\varepsilon > 0$, if A is non- ε -dentable, then for all $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and all $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in A$, $\overline{\text{co}}(A) = \overline{\text{co}}(A \setminus (B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_n)))$.*

Proof. Let A , ε , δ , and a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be as above. Suppose there exists $x \in \overline{\text{co}}(A) \setminus \overline{\text{co}}(A \setminus (B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_n)))$. By Hahn-Banach separation, we can pick a slice S of $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ containing x and disjoint from $\overline{\text{co}}(A \setminus (B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_n)))$. Then $S \cap A$ is a slice of A disjoint from $A \setminus (B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_n))$, and thus $S \cap A \subseteq B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_n)$, which implies $\alpha(S \cap A) \leq 2\delta < \varepsilon$, contradicting Proposition 3.1. \square

We can use Corollary 3.2 to construct A -valued quasimartingales and $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ -valued martingales that diverge in a sharp manner.

Corollary 3.3. *For any nonempty, bounded, non- ε -dentable $A \subseteq X$, any $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and any positive, summable sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, there exists a filtration of finite σ -algebras $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ on $[0, 1]$, each of whose atoms are intervals, and an $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted sequence of random variables $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that, for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$ and $m \neq n \geq 0$,*

- (1) M_n takes values in A .
- (2) $\|M_n(s) - M_m(t)\| > \delta$.
- (3) $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -quasimartingale: $\|\mathbb{E}(M_{n+1}|\mathcal{A}_n) - M_n\|_\infty < \delta_n$.

Proof. Let $A \subseteq X$ and $\delta > 0$ be as above. We construct the martingale inductively. Let x_0 be any point of A , \mathcal{A}_0 the trivial σ -algebra, and $M_0 \equiv x_0$. Suppose that, for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{A}_n and M_n have been constructed for all $n \leq N$ and satisfy the conclusion of the Corollary 3.3. Let J be an atom of \mathcal{A}_N , and let x_J be the value of M_N on J . Let $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\} \subseteq A$ be the set of all elements in the image of any one of the M_n , $n \leq N$. By Corollary 3.2, $x_J \in \overline{\text{co}}(A \setminus (B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_k)))$. Thus, there exists $z_J \in \text{co}(A \setminus (B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_k)))$ such that $\|x_J - z_J\| < \delta_N$. Since $z_J \in \text{co}(A \setminus (B_\delta(a_1) \cup B_\delta(a_2) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(a_k)))$, $z_J = \lambda_1 z_J^1 + \lambda_2 z_J^2 + \dots + \lambda_m z_J^m$ for some $z_J^1, z_J^2, \dots, z_J^m \in A$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m \in (0, 1)$ with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_m = 1$ and $\|z_J^i - a_j\| > \delta$ for all $i \leq m$ and $j \leq k$. Now we subdivide the interval J into m pairwise disjoint subintervals, J_1, J_2, \dots, J_m , with $|J_i| = \lambda_i |J|$ for each i . Repeating this process for each atom $J \in \mathcal{A}_N$ gives us a collection of pairwise disjoint intervals, and we define \mathcal{A}_{N+1} to be the σ -algebra that they generate. On each J_i , we define M_{N+1} to be z_J^i . Then conclusions (1) and (2) hold, and (3) holds since $\|\mathbb{E}(M_{N+1}|\mathcal{A}_N) - M_N\|_\infty = \sup_{J,i} \|z_J - z_J^i\| < \delta_N$. \square

Corollary 3.4. *For any nonempty, bounded, non- ε -dentable $A \subseteq X$, any $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and any positive, summable sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, there exists a filtration of finite σ -algebras $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ on $[0, 1]$, each of whose atoms are intervals, an $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted quasimartingale $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$, and an $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted martingale $(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that, for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$ and $m \neq n \geq 0$,*

- (1) M_n takes values in A .
- (2) \overline{M}_n takes values in $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$.
- (3) $\|M_n - \overline{M}_n\|_\infty < \delta_n$.
- (4) $\|M_n(s) - M_m(t)\|, \|\overline{M}_n(s) - \overline{M}_m(t)\| > \delta$.

Proof. Let $A \subseteq X$, and $\delta > 0$ be as above. Choose $\delta' \in (\delta, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ and assume $\sum_{n=0}^\infty \delta_n < \delta' - \delta$. Choose a positive sequence $(\gamma_k)_{k \geq 0}$ such that $\sum_{k=n}^\infty \gamma_k < \delta_n$, and note that this implies $\sum_{n=0}^\infty \gamma_n < \sum_{n=0}^\infty \delta_n < \delta' - \delta$. By Corollary 3.3, there is a filtration $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and an A -valued, $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted quasimartingale $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\|M_n(s) - M_m(t)\| > \delta'$ for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$, $m \neq n$, and $\|\mathbb{E}(M_{n+1}|\mathcal{A}_n) - M_n\|_\infty < \gamma_n$. This inequality, together with the fact that $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$

is summable (and thus convergent to 0), implies, for each $n \geq 0$, the sequence $(\mathbb{E}(M_k|\mathcal{A}_n))_{k \geq n}$ is Cauchy in $L^\infty(I; X)$. Indeed, for $k > j \geq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}(M_k - M_j|\mathcal{A}_n)\|_{L^\infty(I; X)} &\leq \sum_{r=j}^{k-1} \|\mathbb{E}(M_{r+1} - M_r|\mathcal{A}_n)\|_{L^\infty(I; X)} \\ &\leq \sum_{r=j}^{k-1} \|\mathbb{E}(M_{r+1} - M_r|\mathcal{A}_r)\|_{L^\infty(I; X)} = \sum_{r=j}^{k-1} \|\mathbb{E}(M_{r+1}|\mathcal{A}_r) - M_r\|_{L^\infty(I; X)} \\ &\leq \sum_{r=j}^{k-1} \gamma_r \leq \delta_j \end{aligned}$$

Thus we may set $\overline{M}_n := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(M_k|\mathcal{A}_n)$. Clearly, $(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is adapted to $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and takes values in $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$, showing (2). Let us check the martingale property:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\overline{M}_{n+1}|\mathcal{A}_n) &= \mathbb{E}(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(M_k|\mathcal{A}_{n+1})|\mathcal{A}_n) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(M_k|\mathcal{A}_{n+1})|\mathcal{A}_n) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(M_k|\mathcal{A}_n) = \overline{M}_{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

showing (1). Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\overline{M}_n - M_n\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \|\mathbb{E}(M_{k+1} - M_k|\mathcal{A}_n)\|_\infty \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \|\mathbb{E}(M_{k+1} - M_k|\mathcal{A}_k)\|_\infty \\ &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \|\mathbb{E}(M_{k+1}|\mathcal{A}_k) - M_k\|_\infty \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \gamma_k < \delta_n \end{aligned}$$

showing (3). We then use (3) to show (4):

$$\|\overline{M}_n(s) - \overline{M}_m(t)\| \geq \|M_n(s) - M_m(t)\| - \delta_n - \delta_m > \delta' - (\delta' - \delta) = \delta$$

□

Remark 3.5. The union over n of the image of M_n forms a δ -separated bush in $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$. It is norm closed and lacks extreme points.

4. WEAKLY CLOSED δ -SEPARATED MARTINGALES AND BUSHES

In this section, we sharpen our results from the previous section by constructing an A -valued δ -separated approximate bush that is weakly closed. The argument is more involved than those of the previous section. This again extends results from Bourgain in [Bou79]. A is not assumed to be closed or convex in our case.

Definition 4.1. Let $A \subseteq B_X$ and let $C = \overline{\text{co}}(A)$. For any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and slice $S = S(f, C, \delta)$ of C , we define $S^\gamma = S\left(f, C, \frac{\gamma\delta}{2}\right)$. S^γ is called a γ -shallow parallel of S .

Lemma 4.2. For any $C \subseteq B_X$ closed and convex, any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and any slice S of C , $S^\gamma \subseteq S$. For any $E \subseteq C$ for which $C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S) \cup E)$, $S^\gamma \subseteq \overline{\text{co}}(E) + \overline{B}_\gamma(0) \subseteq \text{co}(E) + B_{2\gamma}(0)$.

Proof. Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $S = S(f, C, \delta)$ a slice of C . Since $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\frac{\gamma\delta}{2} < \delta$ implying $S^\gamma = S\left(f, C, \frac{\gamma\delta}{2}\right) \subseteq S(f, C, \delta) = S$. For the second part, let $E \subseteq C$ such that $C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S) \cup E)$. Let $y \in S^\gamma$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $M := \sup(f(C))$. Since $y \in C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S) \cup E)$, there exist $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $z_1 \in (C \setminus S)$, $z_2 \in \overline{\text{co}}(E)$, and $u \in X$ with $\|u\| < \varepsilon$ such that $y = \lambda z_1 + (1 - \lambda)z_2 + u$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} M - \frac{\gamma\delta}{2} &< f(y) \\ &= \lambda f(z_1) + (1 - \lambda)f(z_2) + f(u) \\ &< \lambda(M - \delta) + (1 - \lambda)M + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

implying $\lambda < \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y - z_2\| &\leq \|y - (1 - \lambda)z_2\| + \|(1 - \lambda)z_2 - z_2\| \\ &= \|\lambda z_1 + u\| + \|\lambda z_2\| \\ &\leq 2\lambda + \varepsilon \\ &\leq \gamma + \frac{2\varepsilon}{\delta} + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, this shows $y \in B_\gamma(z_2) \subseteq \overline{\text{co}}(E) + \overline{B}_\gamma(0)$. The final containment $\overline{\text{co}}(E) + \overline{B}_\gamma(0) \subseteq \text{co}(E) + B_{2\gamma}(0)$ obviously holds. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let $A \subseteq X$ be bounded, nonempty, and non- ε -dentable, and let $C = \overline{\text{co}}(A)$ (by Remark 2.5, C is non- ε -dentable). For any slice S_0 of C , $D \subseteq C$ with $\alpha(D) < \varepsilon$, and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, let $\mathcal{S}(S_0, D)$ be the collection of all slices S of C with $S \subseteq S_0 \setminus D$ and $\mathcal{S}^\gamma(S_0, D) = \{S^\gamma\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}(S_0, D)}$. Let $\Lambda = \Lambda(S_0, D, \gamma) \subseteq C$ denote the union of all sets in $\mathcal{S}^\gamma(S_0, D)$. Then $C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S_0) \cup (\Lambda \cap A))$.*

Proof. Let S_0, D, γ , and Λ be as above. By Corollary 2.10 (with $C' = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S_0) \cup (\Lambda \cap A))$ and $D = D$), it suffices to prove $C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S_0) \cup D \cup (\Lambda \cap A))$. Assume $C \neq \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S_0) \cup D \cup (\Lambda \cap A))$. Then by Hahn-Banach separation, there exists a slice S of C such that $S \subseteq C \setminus \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S_0) \cup D \cup (\Lambda \cap A))$. This implies $S \subseteq S_0$, $S \cap D = \emptyset$, and $S \cap (\Lambda \cap A) = \emptyset$. Then $S \subseteq S_0 \setminus D$. Thus, $S \in \mathcal{S}(S_0, D)$, so $S^\gamma \in \mathcal{S}^\gamma(S_0, D)$, and finally $S^\gamma \subseteq \Lambda$. But since we also have $S^\gamma \subseteq S$ and $S \cap (\Lambda \cap A) = \emptyset$, $(S^\gamma \cap A) = S^\gamma \cap (\Lambda \cap A) = \emptyset$, a contradiction since $S^\gamma \cap A$ is a slice of A (since S^γ is a slice of $C = \overline{\text{co}}(A)$) and slices of nonempty sets are nonempty. \square

4.1. The Construction.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $A \subseteq B_X$ be nonempty and non- ε -dentable (not necessarily closed or convex), and $C = \overline{\text{co}}(A)$ so that C is also non- ε -dentable. Fix $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and assume that A is separable. Then C is separable as well, so $C = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} B_i$ for some open B_i (relative to C) with $\text{diam}(B_i) < \varepsilon$. Let $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of numbers in $(0, 1)$. There exist a finitely branching tree $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$, an $(2\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -approximate bush $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}} \subseteq A$, and slices $(S_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ of C such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

- (1) For all $b \in \mathbb{T}_n$, $x_b \in S_b^{\delta_n} \cap A \subseteq S_b$.
- (2) If $n \geq 1$, then for all $b \in \mathbb{T}_n$, $S_b \cap B_{n-1} = \emptyset$ and $S_b \cap \left(\bigcup_{|p| \leq n-1} B_\delta(x_p)\right) = \emptyset$.
- (3) If $n \geq 1$, then for all $b \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$, if $(b, 1), \dots, (b, q)$ are the children of b , then $S_{(b, i)} \subseteq S_b$ and the approximate bush property is satisfied: $x_b \in \text{co}(x_{(b, 1)}, \dots, x_{(b, q)}) + B_{2\delta_{n-1}}(0)$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on n . For the base case, let $S_\emptyset = C$ and let x_\emptyset be any element of $S_\emptyset^{\delta_0}$. For the inductive step, let $n \geq 0$ and assume $\mathbb{T}_{\leq n}, (x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_{\leq n}} \subseteq A$, and $(S_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_{\leq n}} \subseteq C$ have been constructed, and satisfy (1)-(3). Let $b \in \mathbb{T}_n$. Let

$D := B_n \cup \bigcup_{|p| \leq n} B_\delta(x_p)$, so that $\alpha(D) < \varepsilon$. As in Lemma 4.3, let $\mathcal{S}(S_b, D)$ be the collection of all slices S of C such that $S \subseteq S_b \setminus D$, $\mathcal{S}^{\delta_{n+1}}(S_b, D) = \{S^{\delta_{n+1}}\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}(S_b, D)}$, and $\Lambda = \bigcup \mathcal{S}^{\delta_{n+1}}(S_b, D)$. By Lemma 4.3, $C = \overline{\text{co}}((C \setminus S_b) \cup (\Lambda \cap A))$. Then by Lemma 4.2, $S_b^{\delta_n} \subseteq \text{co}(\Lambda \cap A) + B_{2\delta_n}(0)$. Then since $x_b \in S_b^{\delta_n}$, there exists $z \in \text{co}(\Lambda \cap A)$ such that $\|x_b - z\| < 2\delta_n$. Let $z_1, \dots, z_q \in \Lambda \cap A$ and $\lambda_1^b, \dots, \lambda_q^b \in [0, 1]$ such that $z = \lambda_1^b z_1 + \dots + \lambda_q^b z_q$. For each $i = 1, \dots, q$, since $z_i \in \Lambda$, there are slices $S_{z_i} \in \mathcal{S}(S_b, D)$ of C with $z_i \in S_{z_i}^{\delta_{n+1}}$, by definition of Λ . We now define the children of b to be $(b, 1), \dots, (b, q)$, $x_{(b,i)}$ to be z_i , and $S_{(b,i)}$ to be S_{z_i} . Repeating this process for each $b \in \mathbb{T}_n$ gives us \mathbb{T}_{n+1} , $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_{n+1}} \subseteq A$, and $(S_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_{n+1}} \subseteq C$.

(1) and (3) hold immediately by construction. It is also clear that (2) holds by recalling that $S_{(b,i)} \in \mathcal{S}(S_b, D)$, and then examining the definition of D and $\mathcal{S}(S_b, D)$. \square

Remark 4.5. The assumption that A is separable can be removed (at the penalty of replacing ε by $\varepsilon/2$) because of the following result: under the hypothesis of Theorem 4.4, A contains a countable subset that is non- $\varepsilon/2$ -dentable. This is essentially proved in [May73, Lemma 2.2], but we'll include the argument here. Since $\text{diam}(S) > \varepsilon$ for every slice S of A , it follows that no slice is contained in a closed ball $B_{\varepsilon/2}(x)$. Hence, if $a \in A$, then $a \in \overline{\text{co}}(A \setminus B_{\varepsilon/2}(a))$. So there exists a countable set $T(a) \subseteq A \setminus B_{\varepsilon/2}(a)$ such that $a \in \overline{\text{co}}(T(a))$. By applying this fact iteratively as in [May73, Lemma 2.2], we can construct a countable $A_0 \subseteq A$ such that for every $a \in A_0$, we have $a \in \overline{\text{co}}(A_0 \setminus B_{\varepsilon/2}(a))$. Hence every slice S of A_0 satisfied $\text{diam}(S) > \varepsilon/2$. Hence A_0 is not $\varepsilon/2$ -dentable.

Corollary 4.6. *For any separable $A \subseteq B_X$ nonempty and non- ε -dentable, any $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and any positive $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, there exists a δ -separated, $(\delta_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ -approximate bush $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ in A such that any other set $(y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}} \subseteq C = \overline{\text{co}}(A)$, with $\sup_{b \in \mathbb{T}_n} \|y_b - x_b\| < \gamma_n$ for some $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$, is weakly closed and discrete. In particular, $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ is weakly closed and discrete.*

Proof. Let A , δ , $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be as above. Applying the construction of Theorem 4.4, with $(\delta_n/2)_{n \geq 0}$ in place of $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, yields a bush $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$. By Theorem 4.4(1), $x_b \in A$ for all $b \in \mathbb{T}$. Suppose $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{T}$ with $|b_2| > |b_1|$. Then by Theorem 4.4(1), $x_{b_2} \in S_{b_2}$, and by Theorem 4.4(2), $S_{b_2} \cap B_\delta(x_{b_1}) = \emptyset$, so $\|x_{b_2} - x_{b_1}\| > \delta$. This means the bush is δ -separated. By Theorem 4.4(3), if $b \in \mathbb{T}$ and $(b, 1), \dots, (b, q)$ are the children of b , then $x_b \in \text{co}(x_{(b,1)}, \dots, x_{(b,q)}) + B_{\delta_n}(0)$. This means the bush is $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -approximate.

Finally, let $(y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}} \subseteq C$, with $\sup_{b \in \mathbb{T}_n} \|y_b - x_b\| < \gamma_n$ for some $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$, and let z belong to the weak closure of $(y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$. Since C is norm closed and convex, it is weakly closed, and thus $z \in C$. Then $z \in B_i$ for some i . Consider S_b for $|b| = i + 1$. Then $S_b = S(f_b, C, \alpha_b)$ for some $f_b \in B_{X^*}$ and $\alpha_b > 0$. Hence

$$z \in B_i \subseteq C \setminus S_b = \{x \in C : f_b(x) \leq \sup f(C) - \alpha_b\}$$

Since B_i is open in the norm topology relative in C and C is convex, it follows that $B_i \subseteq \{x \in C : f_b(x) < \sup f_b(C) - \alpha_b\}$. Since $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$, we can find $\gamma > 0$ and N large enough so that $B_i \subseteq \{x \in C : f_b(x) < \sup f_b(C) - \alpha_b - \gamma\}$, $N \geq i + 1$, and $\gamma_n < \gamma$ for all $n \geq N$. Then we set $U_b := \{x \in C : f_b(x) < \sup f_b(C) - \alpha_b - \gamma\}$ and observe that it is a weak neighborhood of z in C . Hence $U := \bigcap_{|b|=i+1} U_b$ is a weak neighborhood of z in C . Now we wish to show the set $U \cap (y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ is finite, which will imply our desired conclusion that $(y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ is weakly closed and

discrete. We will show that $U \cap (y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ is finite by showing that $U \cap (y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_{\geq N}} = \emptyset$. Consider $b \in \mathbb{T}$ with $|b| \geq N$. Then $\|y_b - x_b\| < \gamma_{|b|} < \gamma$. Let $b_{i+1} \in \mathbb{T}$ denote the unique predecessor of b with $|b_{i+1}| = i + 1$. Then $x_b \in S_b \subseteq S_{b_{i+1}}$, and hence $f_{b_{i+1}}(x_b) > \sup f_{b_{i+1}}(C) - \alpha_{b_{i+1}}$. Since $f_{b_{i+1}} \in B_{X^*}$ and $\|y_b - x_b\| < \gamma$, this implies $f_{b_{i+1}}(y_b) > \sup f_{b_{i+1}}(C) - \alpha_{b_{i+1}} - \gamma$. Thus, by definition of $U_{b_{i+1}}$, $y_b \notin U_{b_{i+1}}$. By definition of U this proves $U \cap (y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_{\geq N}} = \emptyset$. \square

Corollary 4.7. *For any $A \subseteq B_X$ nonempty and non- ε -dentable, any $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and any positive sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, there exists a filtration of finite σ -algebras $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$, an A -valued, $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -quasimartingale $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ with $\|M_n(s) - M_m(t)\| > \delta$ for all $n \geq m \geq 0$ and $s, t \in [0, 1]$, and the range of this quasimartingale is weakly closed and discrete.*

Proof. Let $A, \delta, (\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be as above, and apply Corollary 4.6 to obtain a $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -approximate bush $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}}$ which is weakly closed and discrete. We define the filtration $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ on $[0, 1]$ recursively: Let \mathcal{A}_0 be the trivial σ -algebra. Suppose \mathcal{A}_n has been defined as a finite whose atoms are intervals, the atoms are in bijection with \mathbb{T}_n via $b \mapsto I_b$, and for any $b \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ and child $(b, i) \in \mathbb{T}_n$, $\mathcal{L}(I_{(b,i)}) = \mathcal{L}(I_b)\lambda_i^b$. Then for any $b' \in \mathbb{T}_n$ with children $(b', 1), \dots, (b', q)$, we pick any subdivision of $I_{b'}$ into intervals $I_{(b',1)}, \dots, I_{(b',q)}$ so that $\mathcal{L}(I_{(b',i)}) = \mathcal{L}(I_{b'})\lambda_i^{b'}$. Take \mathcal{A}_n to be the σ -algebra generated by these intervals. Then we define M_n to be $\sum_{|b|=n} x_b \chi_{I_b}$. We then have $\|\mathbb{E}(M_{n+1} | \mathcal{A}_n) - M_n\|_{L^\infty} = \sup_{b \in \mathbb{T}_n} \|x_b - \lambda_1 x_{(b,1)} - \dots - \lambda_q x_{(b,q)}\| < \delta_n$. The range of this quasimartingale is exactly the bush, and thus weakly closed and discrete. \square

Corollary 4.8. *For any $A \subseteq B_X$ nonempty and non- ε -dentable, $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and positive, summable sequence $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$, there exist a filtration of finite σ -algebras $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$, an A -valued, $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -quasimartingale $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ -valued, $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -adapted martingale $(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ with, for all $n \neq m \geq 0$ and $s, t \in [0, 1]$,*

- (1) $\|\overline{M}_n(s) - \overline{M}_m(t)\| > \delta$.
- (2) $\|M_n - \overline{M}_n\|_\infty < \delta_n$.
- (3) *The range of $(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is weakly closed and discrete.*

Proof. Let $A, \delta, (\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be as above, and apply Corollary 4.7 to obtain the σ -algebra $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and A -valued, $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -quasimartingale $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ with weakly closed and discrete range. Construct $(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ from $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ just as in the proof of Corollary 3.4, so that $(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is $\overline{\text{co}}(A)$ -valued and (1) and (2) hold. To see (3), again note that the range of $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is exactly $(x_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_n}$ from Corollary 4.6. Since $(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is adapted to the same finite filtration as $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$, (2) implies that the range of \overline{M}_n equals $(y_b)_{b \in \mathbb{T}_n}$ for some $y_b \in \overline{\text{co}}(A)$ and $\sup_{b \in \mathbb{T}_n} \|y_b - x_b\| < \delta_n$. Then Corollary 4.6 implies (3). \square

Corollary 4.9. *For any $A \subseteq B_X$ nonempty and nondentable, there exists a countable set $F \subseteq \overline{\text{co}}(A)$ such that*

- (1) $\lim_{F \ni f \rightarrow \infty} d(f, A) = 0$
- (2) F is weakly closed and discrete and $\text{Ext}(F) = \emptyset$.
- (3) $\overline{\text{co}}(F)$ has no weak denting point.
- (4) $\overline{\text{co}}(F) \cap \text{Ext}(\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F)) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Let A be as above. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ such that A is non- ε -dentable and let $\delta < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Let δ_n be any positive, summable sequence, and let $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \geq 0}, (M_n)_{n \geq 0}$, and

$(\overline{M}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be the filtration, $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ -quasimartingale, and martingale afforded to us by Corollary 4.8. Let $F \subseteq \overline{\text{co}}(A)$ be the range of the martingale. Since $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is A -valued and $\|M_n - \overline{M}_n\|_\infty < \delta_n$, $\lim_{F \ni f \rightarrow \infty} d(f, A) = 0$, showing (1).

By Corollary 4.8, F is weakly closed and discrete and clearly has no extreme point since it is a δ -separated bush, showing (2).

Since weak denting points of $\overline{\text{co}}(F)$ are extreme points, and since F has no extreme points, the set of weak denting points of $\overline{\text{co}}(F)$ is contained in $\overline{\text{co}}(F) \setminus F$. But since $\overline{\text{co}}(F) \setminus F$ is weakly open in $\overline{\text{co}}(F)$, it follows that $\overline{\text{co}}(F) \setminus F$ contains no weak denting point. This shows (3).

For (4), we first observe that the converse of the Krein-Milman theorem ([DS58, Lemma 8.5]) implies that every extreme point of $\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F)$ is a weak* denting point of $\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F)$. To see this, let x be an extreme point of $\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F)$ and assume x is not a weak* denting point. Then there is an open neighborhood $U \subseteq X^{**}$ of x such that $x \in \overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F) \setminus U)$. Then since $\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F) \setminus U$ is weak* compact, the converse to Krein-Milman implies every extreme point of $\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F) \setminus U)$, in particular x , is contained in $\overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F) \setminus U$, a contradiction. Then (4) follows from (3) since weak* denting points of $\overline{\text{co}}(F) \cap \overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F) \subseteq X^{**}$ are the same as weak denting points of $\overline{\text{co}}(F) \cap \overline{\text{co}}^{w*}(F) \subseteq X$.

□

REFERENCES

- [Bou79] J. Bourgain, *La propriété de Radon-Nikodym: Cours de 3ème cycle*, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris VI (1979).
- [DS58] Nelson Dunford and Jacob T. Schwartz, *Linear Operators. I. General Theory*, With the assistance of W. G. Bade and R. G. Bartle. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 7, Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York; Interscience Publishers, Ltd., London, 1958. MR 0117523
- [May73] Hugh B. Maynard, *A geometrical characterization of Banach spaces with the Radon-Nikodym property*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **185** (1973), 493–500. MR 385521

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA, SC 29208, USA
E-mail address: `dilworth@math.sc.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, URBANA, IL 61801, USA
E-mail address: `cgartla2@illinois.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN URBANA, IL 61801, USA AND INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, SOFIA, BULGARIA
E-mail address: `denka@math.uiuc.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO 63103, USA
E-mail address: `nrandria@slu.edu`