Comment.Math.Univ.Carolin. 42,2 (2001)281–297

On inverses of δ-convex mappings

Jakub Duda

Abstract. In the first part of this paper, we prove that in a sense the class of bi-Lipschitz δ-convex mappings, whose inverses are locally δ-convex, is stable under finite-dimensional δ-convex perturbations. In the second part, we construct two δ-convex mappings from ℓ_1 onto ℓ_1, which are both bi-Lipschitz and their inverses are nowhere locally δ-convex. The second mapping, whose construction is more complicated, has an invertible strict derivative at 0. These mappings show that for (locally) δ-convex mappings an infinite-dimensional analogue of the finite-dimensional theorem about δ-convexity of inverse mappings (proved in [7]) cannot hold in general (the case of ℓ_2 is still open) and answer three questions posed in [7].

Keywords: delta-convex mappings, strict differentiability, normed linear spaces

Classification: Primary 47H99; Secondary 46G99, 58C20

1. Introduction

Let X, Y be normed linear spaces, $A \subset X$ be an open convex set. A mapping $F: A \to Y$ is called *δ-convex on A*, if there exists a continuous function $f: A \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $y^* \circ F + f$ is a continuous convex function on A for each $y^* \in Y^*$, $\|y^*\| = 1$. If this is the case, we say that f is a *control function of F*. A mapping $G: B \to Y$ defined on an open set $B \subset X$ is said to be *locally δ-convex*, if for each point $b \in B$ there exists an open convex neighborhood V of b so that $G|_V$ is δ-convex.

This definition of (local) δ-convexity for Banach space-valued mappings is due to L. Veselý and L. Zajíček and was introduced in [7]. Much about properties of (locally) δ-convex mappings can be found in that article. The history of the notion of a δ-convex function goes back to A.D. Alexandrov ([1], [2]). P. Hartman [5] defined and investigated the notion of delta-convex mappings between Euclidean spaces. For the history of notions of δ-convex functions and mappings, we refer the interested reader to [7]. They have applications in many areas of mathematics, for example in the non-smooth optimization theory. For a recent application of δ-convex functions in the theory of Banach spaces, see articles of M. Cepedello Boiso [3], [4].

In the first part of this paper, we prove a theorem about δ-convexity of inverses of δ-convex mappings (an analogue of the finite-dimensional Theorem 5.2 in [7])

The author was supported by the grant GAČR 201/00/0767.

for a special class of (infinite-dimensional) δ-convex mappings. This class contains bi-Lipschitz δ-convex mappings, that arose as a sum of a bi-Lipschitz δ-convex mapping with a locally δ-convex inverse and a finite-dimensional δ-convex mapping. Our theorem is also a strengthening of Theorem 4.5 in [7] for the considered special class of mappings. So we obtain that a counterexample to Problem 1 in [7] cannot be found in that class.

L. Veselý and L. Zajíček ask in [7] (Problem 1) whether the inverse of a locally δ-convex bi-Lipschitz mapping is also locally δ-convex. They prove that it is so when we consider the finite dimensional case (see Theorem 4.5 in [7]) and that the answers is yes "almost everywhere" (on an open dense set), when the source space is an Asplund-Banach space and we consider bi-Lipschitz locally δ-convex bijections between open convex sets (see Theorem 4.6 in [7]). In the second part of this paper we construct two δ-convex mappings from ℓ_1 onto ℓ_1, which are both bi-Lipschitz and whose inverses are nowhere locally δ-convex. This gives a negative answer to the question asked in Problem 1 ([7]). The second mapping also has an invertible strict derivative at 0 (however, we pay for this property by substantial technical complications). This gives a (negative) solution to Problem 2 from [7].

The authors of [7] also ask (Problem 3) whether a δ-convex mapping, which is strictly differentiable at a point, admits a control function, which is strictly differentiable at that point. In [6] the authors gave an answer to that question by constructing a δ-convex function $\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, which is strictly differentiable at 0, but which does not admit a control function having this property. It is possible to prove (using a part of proof of Theorem 4.6 from [7]) that our second mapping neither admits a control function, which is strictly differentiable at 0, so we give another solution to this problem.

Let $F\colon X \to Y$ be a mapping between two normed linear spaces and $K > 0$. By $\operatorname{Lip} F$ we shall denote the smallest Lipschitz constant of F. We shall say, that F is *K-bi-Lipschitz* if for all $x, y \in X$ it holds that $\frac{1}{K}\|x-y\| \le \|F(x)-F(y)\| \le K\|x-y\|$. We say that $F\colon X \to Y$ is *bi-Lipschitz*, if there is a constant $L > 0$ such that F is L-bi-Lipschitz.

Let X, Y be normed linear spaces, $D \subset X$ and $F\colon D \to Y$ a mapping. We say that $A \in L(X,Y)$ is a *strict derivative of F at a point $a \in D$* (see [7]), if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|F(y)-F(x)-A(y-x)\| \le \varepsilon\|y-x\|$, whenever $x, y \in B(a,\delta)$, where we take $B(a,\delta) = \{x \in X; \|x-a\| < \delta\}$.

Let us recall some facts about δ-convex mappings:

Lemma 1.1 ([7, Lemma 1.5]). *Let X, Y, Z, T be normed linear spaces, let $A \subset X$ and $B \subset Z$ be open convex sets. Suppose that $F\colon A \to Y$ is a δ-convex mapping with a control function f on A and let $G\colon Z \to X$, $H\colon Y \to T$ be continuous affine mappings. Then the following assertions hold.*

(a) *The mapping $H \circ F$ is δ-convex with the control function* $\operatorname{Lip}(H) \cdot f$ *on A.*
(b) *If $G(B) \subset A$, then $F \circ G$ is δ-convex with the control function $f \circ G$ on B.*

Proposition 1.2 ([7, Proposition 1.10]). *Every δ-convex mapping is locally Lipschitz.*

Corollary 1.3 ([7, Corollary 1.18]). *Let X, Y be normed linear spaces, $A \subset X$ be an open convex set and let both $F: A \to Y, f: A \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) *F is δ-convex on A with a control function f;*

(ii) $\left\| \frac{F(x)+F(y)}{2} - F\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \right\|_Y \le \frac{f(x)+f(y)}{2} - f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)$ *whenever $x, y \in A$.*

Proposition 1.4 ([7, Proposition 4.1]). *Let X, Y, Z be normed linear spaces and let $A \subset X$, $B \subset Y$ be open convex sets. Let $F: A \to B$ be δ-convex on A with a control function f and let $G: B \to Z$ be δ-convex on B with a control function g. Suppose further that G, g are Lipschitz on B with constants L_G, L_g.*

Then the composite mapping $G \circ F$ is δ-convex on A with a control function $h = g \circ F + (L_G + L_g) f$.

Theorem 1.5 ([7, Theorem 5.1]). *Let X, Z be normed linear spaces and let Y be a finite dimensional normed linear space. Let $A \subset X$, $B \subset Y$ be open convex sets, $c > 0$ and let $G: A \times B \to Z$ be a δ-convex mapping such that $\|G(x, y) - G(x, \widetilde{y})\| \ge c\|y - \widetilde{y}\|$ whenever $x \in A$, $y, \widetilde{y} \in B$. Let $\varphi: A \to B$ be a mapping satisfying $G(x, \varphi(x)) = 0$ on A.*

Then φ is locally δ-convex on A.

2. Inverse theorem

Theorem 2.1. *Let X, Z be Banach spaces, $A \subset X$, $B, G \subset Z$ be nonempty open sets, let further A be convex, and let $F: A \to B$ be a bi-Lipschitz δ-convex mapping onto B, such that F^{-1} is locally δ-convex on B. Let $\xi: A \to Z$ be δ-convex and such that* $\dim \operatorname{span} \xi(A) < \infty$. *Further let $H = F + \xi$ be a bi-Lipschitz mapping onto G.*

Then the mapping $H^{-1}: G \to A$ is locally δ-convex.

Remark 1. The mapping H from Theorem 2.1 is δ-convex because it is a sum of two such mappings.

Proof: We want to prove that H^{-1} is locally δ-convex. Let us denote $Y = \operatorname{span} \xi(A)$. Choose $z_0 \in G$. Denote $x_0 = H^{-1}(z_0)$ and choose $\varepsilon > 0$ so, that $B(F(x_0), \varepsilon) \subset B$ and so that F^{-1} is δ-convex on $B(F(x_0), \varepsilon)$. Put $V = B_Y(\xi(x_0), \varepsilon/2)$ and choose an open convex neighborhood U of z_0 so that

$$\xi\left(H^{-1}(U)\right) \subset V \quad \text{and} \quad U \subset B(z_0, \varepsilon/2). \tag{2.1}$$

This is possible since H is bi-Lipschitz and ξ is locally Lipschitz (see Proposition 1.2). Then $U - V \subset B(F(x_0), \varepsilon)$ holds, as for $x \in U, y \in V$ we have the following inequality

$$\|x - y - F(x_0)\| = \|x - F(x_0) - \xi(x_0) + \xi(x_0) - y\| < 2\,\frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Let us define

$$L: U \times V \to Y, L(x, y) = H\left(F^{-1}(x - y)\right) - x.$$

It follows from Proposition 1.4 that the mapping L is δ-convex. Take arbitrary $x \in U, y, \overline{y} \in V$. Then the following holds for L:

$$\begin{aligned} \|L(x,y) - L(x,\overline{y})\| &= \left\|H\left(F^{-1}(x-y)\right) - H\left(F^{-1}(x-\overline{y})\right)\right\| \\ &\geq K^{-1}\left\|F^{-1}(x-y) - F^{-1}(x-\overline{y})\right\| \\ &\geq K^{-1}C^{-1}\|\overline{y} - y\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $K > 0$ ($C > 0$, respectively) is a bi-Lipschitz constant of the mapping H (of the mapping F, respectively). To be able to apply Theorem 5.1 from [7], it remains to show that for each $x \in U$ it holds for $\varphi(x) = \xi \circ H^{-1}(x)$ that $L(x, \varphi(x)) = 0$ and $\varphi(x) \in V$. We put $z = H^{-1}(x)$ and then the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, \varphi(x)) &= H\left(F^{-1}(x - \varphi(x))\right) - x \\ &= H\left(F^{-1}(F(z) + \xi(z) - \xi(z))\right) - H(z) \\ &= H(z) - H(z) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

From the first formula in (2.1) it is easy to see that $\varphi(x) \in V$. Thus we obtained a mapping $\varphi: U \to V$. Now all the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 are fulfilled (following the notation of [7] we take $X = Y, Z, Y$, $A = U$, $B = V$, $c = K^{-1}C^{-1}$, $G = L, \varphi$). So, we get that φ is locally δ-convex in U.

Pick a neighborhood U_0 of z_0 so that φ is δ-convex on U_0. Then in $W = U \cap U_0$ we have $H^{-1}(x) = F^{-1}(x - \varphi(x))$ and it follows from Proposition 1.4 that H^{-1} is δ-convex on W. □

3. Two examples

The following theorem gives answers to questions asked in Problems 1, 2, and 3 in [7].

Theorem 3.1. *There is a mapping $N: \ell_1 \to \ell_1$, which is bi-Lipschitz, maps ℓ_1 onto ℓ_1, is δ-convex, and such that the inverse mapping N^{-1} is nowhere locally δ-convex.*

There even exists a mapping $\widetilde{N}: \ell_1 \to \ell_1$, which is bi-Lipschitz, δ-convex, onto ℓ_1, strictly differentiable at 0, $\widetilde{N}'(0) = Id_{\ell_1}$, and such that the inverse $\widetilde{N}^{-1}$ is nowhere locally δ-convex.

Remark 2. 1. A mapping is nowhere locally δ-convex, when it is not locally δ-convex at any point.

2. The mapping N only gives answer to question in Problem 1, but it is the most interesting one. The construction of N is substantially simpler than that of $\widetilde{N}$, regardless of the fact, that they both use a similar idea.
3. Let us also note, that the mapping $\widetilde{N}$ is a counterexample to Problem 3, because it does not admit a control function, which is strictly differentiable at 0. Suppose such a function exists. Then it follows from the proof of Theorem 4.6 in [7] that the mapping $\widetilde{N}^{-1}$ is δ-convex in a neighbourhood of 0 and that is a contradiction with the fact that $\widetilde{N}^{-1}$ is nowhere locally δ-convex.
4. In the proof of Theorem 3.1 we always consider $\mathbb{R}^n$ endowed with the ℓ_1-norm (i.e. $\|x\| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$).

Let us first prove some auxiliary lemmas. The "building blocks" for our mappings will be mappings between $\mathbb{R}^n$ with some suitable properties.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $c \in (0,1)$, $L > 0$, and let $\xi_i: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, be c-Lipschitz δ-convex functions and let $\varphi_i: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, be their L-Lipschitz control functions satisfying $\varphi_i(0) = 0$. Then the mapping $\Psi: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ (defined as $(\Psi(x))_i = \xi_i(x_{i+1})$ for $i < n$ and $(\Psi(x))_n = 0$) is c-Lipschitz and δ-convex with control function $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as $\varphi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varphi_i(x_{i+1})$ (note that $\varphi(0) = 0$). If we further define a mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ as $F(x) = x - \Psi(x)$, then F and F^{-1} are Lipschitz with the constant $\max\left\{\frac{1}{1-c}, 1+c\right\}$, F is δ-convex with the control function φ, and F maps $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n$. It also holds that* $\operatorname{Lip} \varphi \leq L$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $M \geq 0$. If there exists an M-Lipschitz function $\theta: B(0, \varepsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$, which is a control function for $F^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$, then there exists an M-Lipschitz control function for $\xi_1 \circ \dots \circ \xi_{n-1}$ on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$.

Proof of Lemma 3.2: Let us first prove, that Ψ is Lipschitz. For the rest of the proof choose $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$\|\Psi(x) - \Psi(y)\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |\xi_i(x_{i+1}) - \xi_i(y_{i+1})| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c\,|x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}| \leq c\,\|x - y\|_1.$$

Considering φ, we get

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| = \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varphi_i(x_{i+1}) - \varphi_i(y_{i+1})\right| \leq L \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |x_{i+1} - y_{i+1}| \leq L\|x - y\|_1.$$

Let us see why Ψ is δ-convex:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{\Psi(x)+\Psi(y)}{2}-\Psi\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)\right\|_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\left|\frac{\xi_i(x_{i+1})+\xi_i(y_{i+1})}{2}-\xi_i\left(\frac{x_{i+1}+y_{i+1}}{2}\right)\right| \\
&\le \sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\frac{\varphi_i(x_{i+1})+\varphi_i(y_{i+1})}{2}-\varphi_i\left(\frac{x_{i+1}+y_{i+1}}{2}\right) \qquad (3.2)\\
&= \frac{\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)}{2}-\varphi\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows from Corollary 1.3 that Ψ is δ-convex with the control function φ.

Let us now look at F — it is certainly a δ-convex mapping as a sum of such maps. To see that F is bi-Lipschitz, let us look at the following estimates:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(1-\operatorname{Lip}\Psi)\|x-y\|_1 &\le \|x-y\|_1-\|\Psi(x)-\Psi(y)\|_1\\
&\le \|F(x)-F(y)\|_1\\
&\le (1+\operatorname{Lip}\Psi)\|x-y\|_1.
\end{aligned}
$$

So $(1-c)\|x-y\|_1 \le \|F(x)-F(y)\|_1 \le (1+c)\|x-y\|_1$.

Let us show that a convex function is a control function of F iff it is a control function of Ψ. It follows from Corollary 1.3 and from the following equality:

$$
\left\|\frac{F(x)+F(y)}{2}-F\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)\right\|_1=\left\|\frac{\Psi(x)+\Psi(y)}{2}-\Psi\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)\right\|_1.
$$

So we get (see (3.2)), that φ is a control function of F.

Now we show that F maps $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose we have $y=F(x)$. Then $y_1=x_1-\xi_1(x_2),\dots,y_{n-1}=x_{n-1}-\xi_{n-1}(x_n), y_n=x_n$. We see that we can express x_i using y_j, $j=1,\dots,n$. We can also use a different argument, which is based on the Banach fixed point theorem.

Let θ be according to the assumptions. For $y=(y_1,\dots,y_n)\in B(0,\varepsilon)$ such that $y_i=0$ for $i<n$ it holds, that $F^{-1}(y)=(\xi_1\circ\dots\circ\xi_{n-1}(y_n),\dots,\xi_{n-1}(y_n),y_n)$, what is shown by direct computation. Let us define a function $t\colon\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^n$ as $t(x)=(\underbrace{0,\dots,0}_{(n-1)-\text{times}},x)$ and denote $\pi\colon\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ the projection onto the first coordinate (i.e. $\pi((x_1,\dots,x_n))=x_1$). Then for $x\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)$ it clearly holds, that $\xi_1\circ\dots\circ\xi_{n-1}(x)=\pi\circ F^{-1}\circ t(x)$. According to Lemma 1.1 it is true, that $F^{-1}\circ t$ is on $(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)$ δ-convex with the control function $\theta\circ t$. Applying the same lemma, we get that $\pi\circ F^{-1}\circ t$ is δ-convex with the control function $\operatorname{Lip}\pi\cdot(\theta\circ t)$. Note that $\operatorname{Lip}\pi=\operatorname{Lip}t=1$. As

$$
\operatorname{Lip}(\operatorname{Lip}\pi\cdot(\theta\circ t))\le \operatorname{Lip}\pi\cdot\operatorname{Lip}\theta\cdot\operatorname{Lip}t=\operatorname{Lip}\theta=M,
$$

the function $\xi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \xi_{n-1}$ is δ-convex on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ with the control function $\theta \circ t$, which is M-Lipschitz. This concludes the proof. $\square$

Remark 3. Let $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Then for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $f'_+(x)$ ($f'_-(x)$, respectively) the right derivative (the left derivative, respectively) of the function f at x, if it exists.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval, $f: U \to \mathbb{R}$ be a δ-convex function and $\varphi: U \to \mathbb{R}$ be its control function. Then the following holds:*

$$\varphi'_+(x) - \varphi'_-(x) \geq \left| f'_+(x) - f'_-(x) \right| \quad \textit{for all} \quad x \in U.$$

Let $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in U$ be an increasing sequence of distinct real numbers, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\operatorname{Lip} \varphi \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left| f'_+(x_i) - f'_-(x_i) \right|.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3: Concerning the first part of the lemma: since φ is a control function for f, the functions $f + \varphi$ and $-f + \varphi$ are convex in U. Take an arbitrary $x \in U$. Then

$$(f + \varphi)'_+(x) \geq (f + \varphi)'_-(x) \text{ and } (-f + \varphi)'_+(x) \geq (-f + \varphi)'_-(x).$$

It is easy to see that for a δ-convex function unilateral derivatives exist. We get that

$$\varphi'_+(x) - \varphi'_-(x) \geq \left| f'_+(x) - f'_-(x) \right|.$$

Concerning the second part of the lemma: it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_+(x_k) - \varphi'_-(x_1) &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\varphi'_+(x_i) - \varphi'_-(x_i) \right) + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \left(\varphi'_-(x_i) - \varphi'_+(x_{i-1}) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\varphi'_+(x_i) - \varphi'_-(x_i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We only used the fact that φ is convex. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Lip} \varphi \geq \left| \varphi'_+(x_k) \right| + \left| \varphi'_-(x_1) \right| \quad &\geq \varphi'_+(x_k) - \varphi'_-(x_1) \\ \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\varphi'_+(x_i) - \varphi'_-(x_i) \right) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left| f'_+(x_i) - f'_-(x_i) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We again used the fact that φ is a convex function. $\square$

Definition 3.4. In the sequel we shall use the following notation: let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k > 0$ be given. Then we define $f_\varepsilon^k\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f_\varepsilon^k(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } x \le 0, \\ k\,x & \text{for } x \in (0, \varepsilon], \\ 2\,k\,\varepsilon - k\,x & \text{for } x \in (\varepsilon, 2\,\varepsilon], \\ 0 & \text{for } x > 2\,\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

We see, that this function is k-Lipschitz. Let us define $g_\varepsilon^k\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$g_\varepsilon^k(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } x \le 0, \\ k\,x & \text{for } x \in (0, \varepsilon], \\ 3\,k\,x - 2\,k\,\varepsilon & \text{for } x \in (\varepsilon, 2\,\varepsilon], \\ 4\,k\,x - 4\,k\,\varepsilon & \text{for } x > 2\,\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Again, it is easy to see that g_ε^k is $4k$-Lipschitz, convex and further, that $(f_\varepsilon^k + g_\varepsilon^k)$, $(-f_\varepsilon^k + g_\varepsilon^k)$ are convex, so f_ε^k is δ-convex with the control function g_ε^k.

The following two lemmas will allow us to construct a sequence of functions with suitable properties. We shall use them for the construction of our mappings.

Definition 3.5. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ be open, $I \subset U$ be an interval, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f\colon U \to \mathbb{R}$ a function. Then we say, that f *is affine in the interval I with tangent c*, if there exists $d \in \mathbb{R}$ so that for all $x \in I$ the equality $f(x) = c\,x + d$ holds. Further we define $\operatorname{supp} f = \{x \in U\,;\, f(x) \ne 0\}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose we are given $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$. Then there exists a sequence of functions $\{h_n\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that the following conditions are fulfilled for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

1. *$h_n(0) = 0$, h_n is c-Lipschitz, δ-convex and there exists ν_n convex control function for h_n satisfying* $\operatorname{Lip} \nu_n \le 4c$, $\nu_n(0) = 0$,
2. *if ϕ_n is a control function for $h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ in $(0, \delta)$, then* $\operatorname{Lip} \phi_n \ge c\,(2c)^{n-1}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.6: We shall construct functions h_n by induction so that conditions 1 and 2 of the lemma are satisfied and also that the following conditions hold for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

3. $h_n(x) \ge 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\operatorname{supp} h_n \subset [0, \delta)$,
4. there exist 2^n disjoint intervals (a_i, b_i), where $i = 1, \dots, 2^n$, so that $h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ is in $[a_i, b_i]$ affine with tangent $\pm\, c^n$ and $h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ is equal to 0 in one of the boundary points of each of these intervals,
5. for the function $\beta = h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ there exist 2^{n-1} points in $(0, \delta)$, where the following condition is fulfilled:

$$\left|\beta'_+(x) - \beta'_-(x)\right| \ge 2\,c^n.$$

We take $h_1 = f^c_{\delta/4}$ and $\nu_1 = g^c_{\delta/4}$. Everything holds, if we take $(a_1, b_1) = (0, \delta/4)$ and $(a_2, b_2) = (\delta/4, \delta/2)$. Suppose that $n > 1$ and we have constructed h_i for $i < n$. Now it suffices to prove, that there exists h_n, so that the required conditions are satisfied. Let us define

$$\widetilde{d} = \min\left\{\max\left\{h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1([a_i, b_i])\right\}; i = 1, \ldots, 2^{n-1}\right\},$$

where a_i, b_i are as in condition 4 for $(n-1)$ and finally

$$d = \min\left\{\widetilde{d}, \delta/2\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Then obviously $d > 0$. We take $h_n = f^c_{d/2}$ and $\nu_n = g^c_{d/2}$. Conditions 1 and 3 are clearly satisfied. It remains to show that the rest of the conditions holds.

Ad 4. Let (a_i, b_i), $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{n-1}$, be as in condition 4 for $(n-1)$. Take $1 \le i \le 2^{n-1}$. Suppose that $h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1(a_i) = 0$. The case when $h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1(b_i) = 0$ is analogous. Then the function $h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ is $[a_i, b_i]$ increasing and equal to $c^{n-1}(x - a_i)$. It follows from (3.3) that there exists $t_i \in (a_i, b_i]$ so that $h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1(t_i) = d$. In $\left[a_i, \frac{a_i+t_i}{2}\right]$ the function $h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ is affine with tangent c^n, it is equal to 0 in a_i, in $\left[\frac{a_i+t_i}{2}, t_i\right]$ the function $h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ is affine with tangent $-c^n$ and it is equal to 0 in t_i.

Intervals of kind either $\left(a_i, \frac{a_i+t_i}{2}\right)$, $\left(\frac{a_i+t_i}{2}, t_i\right)$ or $\left(t_i, \frac{t_i+b_i}{2}\right)$, $\left(\frac{t_i+b_i}{2}, b_i\right)$ (in case that $h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1(b_i) = 0$) form for $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{n-1}$ a family of 2^n intervals, where condition 4 for n is fulfilled.

Ad 5. It is enough to realize that at points of kind $y_i = \frac{a_i+t_i}{2}$ (or $y_i = \frac{t_i+b_i}{2}$) for $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{n-1}$, t_i is taken as in the last two paragraphs, the equality $\left|\beta'_+(y_i) - \beta'_-(y_i)\right| = 2c^n$ holds, where $\beta = h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$. It follows from the selection of h_n and points a_i, b_i. But then also condition 5 from the construction is fulfilled.

Ad 2. Let $\phi\colon (0, \delta) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and a control function for $\beta = h_n \circ \cdots \circ h_1$. We select points z_i for $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{n-1}$. These are taken to be the 2^{n-1} points of condition 5 for n. Then according to Lemma 3.3 the following holds:

$$\operatorname{Lip} \phi \ge \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2^{n-1}} \left|\beta'_+(z_i) - \beta'_-(z_i)\right| = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{n-1} \cdot (2c^n) = c\,(2c)^{n-1}.$$

$\square$

The more complicated version is the following:

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose we are given $\delta > 0$ and $M \in (0,1)$. Then there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\frac{1}{2^m} < M$, and a sequence of functions $\left\{\widetilde{h}_n : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\right\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the following conditions for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

1. *$\widetilde{h}_n(0) = 0$, $\widetilde{h}_n$ is $\left(\frac{1}{2^m}\right)$-Lipschitz, δ-convex and there exists $\widetilde{\nu}_n$, a convex control function for $\widetilde{h}_n$ satisfying $\operatorname{Lip} \widetilde{\nu}_n \leq 4$ and $\widetilde{\nu}_n(0) = 0$,*
2. *let $\psi : (0,\delta) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a control function for $\widetilde{h}_n \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ in $(0,\delta)$. Then*
$$\operatorname{Lip} \psi \geq 2^{n-1},$$
3. *there exists $\lambda_n > 0$ such that $\widetilde{h}_i([0,\lambda_n]) = \{0\}$ for $i \leq n$.*

Definition 3.8. Suppose we are given $a < b, a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $l \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us put $\varepsilon = (b-a)/n$. We divide the interval $[a,b]$ into n subintervals of the same length, with boundary points $c_1 = a, \ldots, c_{n+1} = b$ (thus $c_i = a + (i-1)\cdot\varepsilon$, where $i = 1, \ldots, n+1$). We define a function $f(a,b,n,l) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f(a,b,n,l)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f^l_{\varepsilon/2}(x - c_i).$$

It is easy to see that $f(a,b,n,l)$ is l-Lipschitz. Further we define a function $g(a,b,n,l) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$g(a,b,n,l)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} g^l_{\varepsilon/2}(x - a_i).$$

Then $g(a,b,n,l)$ is a convex, $4nl$-Lipschitz function, which is a control function for $f(a,b,n,l)$. So $f(a,b,n,l)$ is δ-convex on $\mathbb{R}$. Also note that $f(a,b,n,l)$ is equal to 0 outside of (a,b).

It simply follows that for $f(a,b,n,l)$ there exist $2n$ intervals, in which $f(a,b,n,l)$ is affine with tangent $\pm l$, so that it is also equal to 0 in one of the boundary points and the interiors of these intervals are disjoint. Note that there exist n points in (a,b), where $\left|f'_+(x) - f'_-(x)\right| = 2l$.

Proof of Lemma 3.7: Take $m \in \mathbb{N}$, so that $2^{-m} < M$ and we shall define functions $\widetilde{h}_n$, again by induction, to satisfy conditions 1, 2, 3 and further for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

4. it is true that $\widetilde{h}_n(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\operatorname{supp} \widetilde{h}_n \subset [0,\delta)$,
5. there exist $2^{(m+1)n}$ disjoint intervals (a_i, b_i), where $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{(m+1)n}$, so that $\widetilde{h}_n \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ is affine in $[a_i, b_i]$ with tangent $\pm(1/2^m)^n$ and in one of the boundary points of each interval the function $\widetilde{h}_n \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ is equal to 0,

6. for the function $\widetilde{\beta} = \widetilde{h}_n \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ there exist 2^{n-1+mn} points in $(0,\delta)$, where the following inequality holds:

$$\left|\widetilde{\beta}'_+(x) - \widetilde{\beta}'_-(x)\right| \geq 2\left(\frac{1}{2^m}\right)^n .$$

We define $\widetilde{h}_1$, $\widetilde{\nu}_1$ as $\widetilde{h}_1 = f(\delta/2, \delta, 2^m, 1/2^m)$ and $\widetilde{\nu}_1 = g(\delta/2, \delta, 2^m, 1/2^m)$. Further we put $\lambda_1 = \frac{\delta}{2}$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{\delta}{2^{m+2}}$. If we take for $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{m+1}$, the points a_i, b_i to be $a_i = \frac{\delta}{2} + (i-1)\varepsilon$, $b_i = \frac{\delta}{2} + i\varepsilon$, then the intervals (a_i, b_i) satisfy condition 5. For $j = 1, \ldots, 2^m$, we take $t_j = a_{2j}$. Then in points t_j the condition 6 is fulfilled and the validity condition 2 is clear by the choice of λ_1. Now suppose that $n > 1$ and we have constructed $\widetilde{h}_i$ for $i < n$. It suffices to show that there exists $\widetilde{h}_n$ so that all the conditions hold. Define

$$\widetilde{d} = \min\left\{\max\left\{\widetilde{h}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1([a_i, b_i])\right\}; i = 1, \ldots, 2^{(m+1)(n-1)}\right\},$$

where a_i, b_i are taken as in condition 5 for $(n-1)$ and finally

$$d = \min\left\{\widetilde{d}, \delta\right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then clearly $d > 0$. Take $\widetilde{h}_n = f\left(\frac{d}{2}, d, 2^m, \frac{1}{2^m}\right)$ and $\widetilde{\nu}_n = g\left(\frac{d}{2}, d, 2^m, \frac{1}{2^m}\right)$. Conditions 1 and 4 are clearly satisfied. It remains to prove that the remaining conditions hold.

Ad 5. Let (a_i, b_i), $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{(m+1)(n-1)}$, be taken as in condition 5 for $(n-1)$. Take $1 \leq i \leq 2^{(m+1)(n-1)}$. Suppose that $\widetilde{h}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1(a_i) = 0$. The other case when $\widetilde{h}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1(b_i) = 0$ is analogous. Then the function $\widetilde{h}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ is increasing in $[a_i, b_i]$ and equal to $(1/2^m)^{n-1}(x - a_i)$. The choice of d in (3.4) implies, that there exists $t_i \in (a_i, b_i]$ such that $\widetilde{h}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1(t_i) = d$. Then in $[a_i, b_i]$ the following equality holds:

$$\widetilde{h}_n \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1 = f\left(\frac{a_i + t_i}{2}, t_i, 2^m, (1/2^m)^n\right), \tag{3.5}$$

what follows from the special form of $\widetilde{h}_n$ and of $\widetilde{h}_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ on $[a_i, b_i]$.

It follows from the properties of $f(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ which were mentioned in Definition 3.8 that there exist 2^{m+1} intervals, with disjoint interiors, contained in $[a_i, b_i]$, where the function $\widetilde{h}_n \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ is affine with tangent $\pm(1/2^m)^n$ and in one of the boundary points of each interval it is equal to 0.

Thus for each interval $[a_i, b_i]$, where $i = 1, \ldots, 2^{(m+1)(n-1)}$, we found 2^{m+1} subintervals, whose interiors are disjoint and for each of these (sub)intervals the condition 5 for n holds. So we get $2^{(m+1)(n-1)} \cdot 2^{m+1} = 2^{(m+1)n}$ intervals.

Ad 6. It follows from above that in each interval $[a_i, b_i]$, which are taken as in (Ad 5.), there exist 2^m distinct points, where $\left|\widetilde{\beta}'_+(x) - \widetilde{\beta}'_-(x)\right| = 2\left(\frac{1}{2^m}\right)^n$. It is a consequence of the equality (3.5) and of properties of $f(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ mentioned in Definition 3.8. Altogether we obtain $2^{(m+1)(n-1)} \cdot 2^m = 2^{mn+n-1}$ points with the desired property.

Ad 3. Take λ_n to be $\min\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}, d/2\} > 0$. Then for $i < n$ condition 3 is fulfilled thanks to the fact, that $\lambda_n \le \lambda_i$. It is enough to prove that $\widetilde{h}_n \equiv 0$ on $[0, \lambda_n]$. But we have $\widetilde{h}_n = f(d/2, d, 2^m, (1/2^m))$ and from the definition of $f(a, b, n, l)$ this function is equal to 0 outside of (a, b). As we have $\lambda_n \le \frac{d}{2}$, the desired property of h_n simply follows.

Ad 2. We define z_i for $i = 1, \dots, 2^{n-1+mn}$, as the points of condition 6 for n. Let ψ be a control function for $\widetilde{\beta} = \widetilde{h}_n \circ \cdots \circ \widetilde{h}_1$ on $(0, \delta)$. Lemma 3.3 implies

$$\operatorname{Lip}\psi \ge \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2^{n-1+mn}} \left|\widetilde{\beta}'_+(z_i) - \widetilde{\beta}'_-(z_i)\right| = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{n-1+mn} \cdot 2\left(\frac{1}{2^m}\right)^n = 2^{n-1},$$

which was to be proved. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.1: We shall simultaneously construct mappings N and $\widetilde{N}$. We shall write

$$Y = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \oplus_{\ell_1} (\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_1)$$

and find mappings $N, \widetilde{N}\colon Y \to Y$ in form

$$N(x_2, x_3, \dots) = (F_2(x_2), F_3(x_3), \dots),$$
$$\widetilde{N}(x_2, x_3, \dots) = \left(\widetilde{F}_2(x_2), \widetilde{F}_3(x_3), \dots\right),$$

where $F_n, \widetilde{F}_n\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that Y is obviously isometrically isomorphic to ℓ_1. In the sequel we shall use the symbol $\|x\|_Y = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \|x_n\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n}$ even for points $x = (x_2, x_3, \dots) \in \prod_{n=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{R}^n$ which might not belong to Y. It makes proofs shorter.

First we define F_n. Choose $c \in \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)$, fix K such that $K > \max\left\{\frac{1}{1-c}, c+1\right\}$, and $L = 4c$. We shall find F_n, $n > 1$, so that they will satisfy the following conditions for all $n > 1$:

1. $F_n(0) = 0$, F_n is K-bi-Lipschitz, F_n maps $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n$, and is δ-convex on $\mathbb{R}^n$,
2. there exists a convex function $\varphi_n\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, which is L-Lipschitz, $\varphi_n(0) = 0$ and φ_n is a control function for F_n on $\mathbb{R}^n$,
3. suppose that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{n}$ and the function $\theta\colon B(0,\varepsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a control function for $F_n^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$, then $\operatorname{Lip}\theta \ge c \cdot (2c)^{n-2}$.

Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > 1$. Put $\delta = \frac{1}{n}$ and apply Lemma 3.6 with chosen δ, c. We obtain a sequence of functions $\{h_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$. We shall use only the first $(n-1)$ functions. For $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, we define $\xi_{n-j}: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $\xi_{n-j}(x) = h_j(x)$ and $\psi_{n-j}: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $\psi_{n-j}(x) = \nu_j(x)$.

Such ξ_i and ψ_i satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.2. Denote by F_n the mapping F obtained by the application of Lemma 3.2 with ξ_i, ψ_i, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then the mapping F_n is δ-convex, K-bi-Lipschitz, there exists a control function φ_n for F_n, which is L-Lipschitz and $\varphi_n(0) = 0$. It further holds that $F_n(0) = 0$ (because $\xi_i(0) = 0$ for $i \le n$) and F_n maps $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Now we define $\widetilde{F}_n$. Choose $\widetilde{K} \ge 2$ and $\widetilde{L} = 2$. We shall find $\widetilde{F}_n$, $n > 1$, so that they will satisfy the following conditions for all $n > 1$:

1. $\widetilde{F}_n(0) = 0$, $\widetilde{F}_n$ is $\widetilde{K}$-bi-Lipschitz, $\widetilde{F}_n$ maps $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n$ and is δ-convex on $\mathbb{R}^n$,
2. there exists a convex function $\widetilde{\varphi}_n: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, which is $\widetilde{L}$-Lipschitz, $\widetilde{\varphi}_n(0) = 0$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_n$ is a control function for $\widetilde{F}_n$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$,
3. suppose that $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{n}$ and the function $\theta: B(0,\varepsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a control function for $\widetilde{F}_n^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$, then $\operatorname{Lip}\theta \ge 2^{n-2}$,
4. there exists $\Lambda_n > 0$ such that for all $x \in B(0, \Lambda_n)$ it holds that $\widetilde{\Psi}_n(x) = \widetilde{F}_n(x) - x = 0$ and $\widetilde{\Psi}_n$ is $\frac{1}{n}$-Lipschitz.

Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > 1$. Put $\delta = M = \frac{1}{n}$ and we apply Lemma 3.7. We obtain a sequence $\widetilde{h}_i$ and denote $m_n = m$. Put $\Lambda_n = \lambda_{n-1}$, where λ_{n-1} is taken as in condition 3 in Lemma 3.7. Again we shall use the first $(n-1)$ functions. For $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, we define $\widetilde{\xi}_{n-j}: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $\widetilde{\xi}_{n-j}(x) = \widetilde{h}_j(x)$ and $\widetilde{\psi}_{n-j}: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $\widetilde{\psi}_{n-j}(x) = \widetilde{\nu}_j(x)$.

Such $\widetilde{\xi}_i$ and $\widetilde{\psi}_i$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.2 if we take $c = \frac{1}{n}$, $K = \widetilde{K}$, $L = \widetilde{L}$, $\xi_i = \widetilde{\xi}_i$, $\psi_i = \widetilde{\psi}_i$. Denote $\widetilde{F}_n$ the mapping F from Lemma 3.2 used on $\widetilde{\xi}_i$, $\widetilde{\psi}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Then the mapping $\widetilde{F}_n$ is δ-convex, $\widetilde{K}$-bi-Lipschitz, there exists a control function $\widetilde{\varphi}_n$ for $\widetilde{F}_n$, which is $\widetilde{L}$-Lipschitz and $\widetilde{\varphi}_n(0) = 0$. Note that the mapping $\widetilde{\Psi}_n(x) = \widetilde{F}_n(x) - x$ from Lemma 3.7 is $\frac{1}{n}$-Lipschitz. Further $\widetilde{F}_n(0) = 0$ and $\widetilde{F}_n$ maps $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto $\mathbb{R}^n$. Because it holds for $i \le n-1$ that $\widetilde{h}_i([0, \Lambda_n]) = \{0\}$, then for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\|x\| \le \Lambda_n$, it is true, that $\widetilde{\Psi}_n(x) = 0$, what is an easy consequence of the definition of $\widetilde{\Psi}_n$.

It remains to show that conditions 3 hold both for F_n and $\widetilde{F}_n$. It follows from the next proposition. Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{n}$ and let ψ be a control function of $F_n^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$ ($\widetilde{F}_n^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$, respectively). Then* $\operatorname{Lip}(\psi) \ge c \cdot (2c)^{n-2}$ ($\operatorname{Lip}(\psi) \ge 2^{n-2}$, *respectively*).

Proof of Proposition 3.9: Let us suppose first, that ψ is a control function of $F_n^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$. Further, we might suppose, that $\operatorname{Lip}\psi < \infty$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.2 that there exists a control function for $\xi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \xi_{n-1}$ on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, which is $(\operatorname{Lip}\psi)$-Lipschitz; we denote the function α. Because $\xi_{n-j}(x) = h_j(x)$, it holds that $\xi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \xi_{n-1} = h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1$. The function α is certainly a control function for $h_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ h_1$ on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. From Lemma 3.6, condition 2, it follows that $\operatorname{Lip}\alpha \geq c \cdot (2c)^{n-2}$. As $\operatorname{Lip}\alpha \leq \operatorname{Lip}\psi$, we have proved the first part of the proposition.

Now suppose, that ψ is a control function for $\widetilde{F}_n^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$. Then everything is analogous to the case of F_n, the only difference being that we are working with $\widetilde{\xi}_i$, $\widetilde{h}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, and the estimate follows from Lemma 3.7, condition 2. This concludes the proof. $\square$

Let us now look closer at the properties of mappings N and $\widetilde{N}$, that were defined above.

We show first that N maps Y into Y and that it is bi-Lipschitz. Choose $x, y \in Y$. Remember, that $x = (x_2, x_3, \dots)$, where $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (the same holds for y). Then

$$\|N(x) - N(y)\|_Y = \sum_{n>1} \|F_n(x_n) - F_n(y_n)\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n} \leq K \sum_{n>1} \|x - y\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n}.$$

So we get, that $\|N(x) - N(y)\|_Y \leq K\|x - y\|_Y$. Because $N(0) = 0$, then if we take $y = 0$, we get that $N(x) \in Y$. Similar argument gives, that $\|N(x) - N(y)\|_Y \geq \frac{1}{K}\|x - y\|_Y$. For $\widetilde{N}$ we use an analogous computation with $\widetilde{K}$.

For the proof of δ-convexity of N we define a function $\varphi\colon Y \to \mathbb{R}$ as $\varphi(x) = \sum_{n>1} \varphi_n(x_n)$, where φ_n are control functions of F_n, $\varphi_n(0) = 0$ and φ_n is L-Lipschitz. The function φ is well defined, because for $x \in Y$, we obtain

$$|\varphi(x)| = \left|\sum_{n>1} \varphi_n(x_n)\right| = \left|\sum_{n>1} (\varphi_n(x_n) - \varphi_n(0))\right| \leq L \sum_{n>1} \|x_n\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n}. \tag{3.6}$$

By similar estimates as in (3.6) we get, that φ is L-Lipschitz (and thus continuous). Convexity of φ follows from that fact that it is a limit of finite partial sums of convex functions, which are obviously convex.

Note that φ is a control function of N. It follows from Corollary 1.3 and from the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{1}{2}(N(x)+N(y)) - N\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right)\right\|_Y \\
&= \sum_{n>1} \left\| \frac{F_n(x_n)+F_n(y_n)}{2} - F_n\left(\frac{x_n+y_n}{2}\right)\right\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n} \\
&\leq \sum_{n>1} \frac{\varphi_n(x_n)+\varphi_n(y_n)}{2} - \varphi_n\left(\frac{x_n+y_n}{2}\right) \\
&= \frac{\varphi(x)+\varphi(y)}{2} - \varphi\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for $x, y \in Y$. The proof of δ-convexity of $\widetilde{N}$ follows by an analogous argument using $\widetilde{\varphi}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

It is easy to show that N is onto Y. It follows from the fact that F_n's are uniformly bi-Lipschitz and onto. Suppose we are given $y \in Y$. Then $y = (y_2, y_3, \dots)$, where $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^i$. Define $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^i$ as $x_i = F_i^{-1}(y_i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $x = (x_2, x_3, \dots) \in Y$, as

$$\|x\|_Y = \sum_{i>1} \|x_i - 0\| = \sum_{i>1} \left\| F_i^{-1}(y_i) - F_i^{-1}(0) \right\| \leq K \sum_{i>1} \|y_i\| = K\|y\|_Y.$$

Thus $N(x) = y$. That $\widetilde{N}$ is onto Y follows by a similar argument.

Let us show that N^{-1} is nowhere locally δ-convex. For a contradiction let us suppose that we have a point $z \in Y$ and there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and a continuous convex function $\theta\colon B_Y(z,\varepsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ so that θ is a control function of $N^{-1}|_{B(0,\varepsilon)}$. By possibly making the $\varepsilon > 0$ smaller, we can suppose that $\operatorname{Lip}\theta < \infty$ (as continuous convex functions are locally Lipschitz).

First, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

1. $\frac{1}{n} < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$ for $n \geq n_0$;
2. $\sum_{n \geq n_0} \|z_n\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$.

Fix $n > n_0$. For $x \in B_{\mathbb{R}^n}(0, \varepsilon/4)$ we define $E^n(x) \in Y$ as

$$E^n(x)_i = \begin{cases} z_i & \text{for } i \leq n_0; \\ x & \text{for } i = n; \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

Then $E^n(x) \in B_Y(z,\varepsilon)$, because

$$\begin{aligned}
\|z - E^n(x)\| &= \sum_{i>n_0} \|z_i - E^n(x)_i\| = \sum_{\substack{i>n_0 \\ i\neq n}} \|z_i\| + \|z_n - x\| \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{i>n_0 \\ i\neq n}} \|z_i\| + \|z_n\| + \|x\| \quad \leq \quad \frac{3\varepsilon}{4} \quad < \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote $\pi_n: Y \to \mathbb{R}^n$ the projection onto the n-th coordinate (that is $\pi_n((x_2, x_3, \dots)) = x_n$ for $x \in Y$). Then it follows from Lemma 1.1, part (b), that $N^{-1} \circ E^n$ is δ-convex with the control function $\theta \circ E^n$ on $B(0, \varepsilon/4)$. Another application of Lemma 1.1, now part (a), yields that $\pi_n \circ N^{-1} \circ E^n$ is δ-convex with the control function $\mathrm{Lip}(\pi_n) \cdot (\theta \circ E^n)$. As $\mathrm{Lip}(\pi_n) = \mathrm{Lip}(E^n) = 1$, we get

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\mathrm{Lip}(\pi_n) \cdot (\theta \circ E^n)) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(\pi_n) \cdot \mathrm{Lip}\,\theta \cdot \mathrm{Lip}(E^n) = \mathrm{Lip}(\theta). \tag{3.7}$$

Note that for $x \in B_{\mathbb{R}^n}(0, \varepsilon/4)$ it is true, that $F_n^{-1}(x) = \pi_n \circ N^{-1} \circ E^n$. So we obtain, that $\theta \circ E^n$ is a control function for F_n^{-1} on $B(0, \varepsilon/4)$. Condition 3 in definition of F_n implies, that $\mathrm{Lip}(\theta \circ E^n) \geq c \cdot (2c)^{n-2}$, and this, together with (3.7), implies that $\mathrm{Lip}\,\theta \geq \mathrm{Lip}(\theta \circ E^n)$. So we obtained that $\mathrm{Lip}\,\theta \geq c \cdot (2c)^{n-2}$ for all $n > n_0$ and that is a contradiction with the fact that $\mathrm{Lip}\,\theta < \infty$, because $\lim_{n\to\infty} c \cdot (2c)^{n-2} = \infty$ thank to the choice of $c > \frac{1}{2}$.

The proof of the fact that $\widetilde{N}^{-1}$ is nowhere locally δ-convex follows the same lines; the only difference is in the estimates following from Proposition 3.9.

Now we show that $\widetilde{N}$ is strictly differentiable at 0. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, so that $1/n < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Take $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta < \min\{\Lambda_i; i \leq n_0\}$ (see definition of $\widetilde{F}_n$, condition 4). Then $\widetilde{\Psi}_j(x) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^j$, $\|x\| \leq \delta$ and $j \leq n_0$. Pick $x, y \in B_Y(0, \delta)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\widetilde{N}(x) - \widetilde{N}(y) - Id_Y(x-y)\right\|_Y \\
&\quad = \sum_{n>1} \left\|\widetilde{F}_n(x_n) - \widetilde{F}(y_n) - (x_n - y_n)\right\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n} = \sum_{n>1} \left\|\widetilde{\Psi}_n(x_n) - \widetilde{\Psi}_n(y_n)\right\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n} \\
&\quad = \sum_{n=2}^{n_0} \left\|\widetilde{\Psi}_n(x_n) - \widetilde{\Psi}_n(y_n)\right\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n} + \sum_{n>n_0} \left\|\widetilde{\Psi}_n(x_n) - \widetilde{\Psi}_n(y_n)\right\|_{1,\mathbb{R}^n} \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{n>n_0} \frac{1}{n} \|x_n - y_n\| \leq \sum_{n>n_0} \frac{1}{n_0} \|x_n - y_n\| \\
&\quad \leq \frac{1}{n_0} \|x - y\|_Y \leq \varepsilon \|x - y\|_Y.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus Id_Y is the strict derivative of $\widetilde{N}$ at 0. The mapping Id_Y is obviously invertible.

□

Remark 4. The case $X = Y = \ell_2$ remains open for Problems 1 and 2 from [7].

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank Luděk Zajíček for many valuable suggestions and continual encouragement.

References

[1] Alexandrov A.D., *On surfaces represented as the difference of convex functions*, Izvest. Akad. Nauk. Kaz. SSR 60, Ser. Math. Mekh. **3** (1949), 3–20 (in Russian).

[2] Alexandrov A.D., *Surfaces represented by the differences of convex functions*, Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.) **72** (1950), 613–616 (in Russian).

[3] Cepedello Boiso M., *Approximation of Lipschitz functions by Δ-convex functions in Banach spaces*, Israel J. Math. **106** (1998), 269–284.

[4] Cepedello Boiso M., *On regularization in superreflexive Banach spaces by infimal convolution formulas*, Studia Math. **129** (1998), no. 3, 265–284.

[5] Hartman P., *On functions representable as a difference of convex functions*, Pacific J. Math. **9** (1959), 707–713.

[6] Kopecká E., Malý J., *Remarks on delta-convex functions*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **31.3** (1990), 501–510.

[7] Veselý L., Zajíček L., *Delta-convex mappings between Banach spaces and applications*, Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) **289** (1989), 52 pp.

Department of Mathematical Analysis, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Sokolovská 83, 186 75 Prague 8, Czech Republic

Department of Mathematics, 202 Math. Sciences Building, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65211, USA

E-mail: duda@karlin.mff.cuni.cz
duda@math.missouri.edu

(*Received* April 14, 2000)